

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES

VOL. XXVI. No. 10. OCTOBER 1946

PADRE'S HOURS

IF I am not mistaken, there was mention, somewhere in the beginning of my philosophical studies, of certain mysterious things which had no definition; everyone was supposed to know at once what they were, and the most that anyone could do was to describe them. My learned professor had no sense of the future, or he undoubtedly would have instanced "Padre's Hours" as an example. There is hardly a priest in England who has not heard of these, and was, in the war years, supposed to know exactly what to do about them, if they ever came his way. But they have no definition, and, so far as I know, nobody has described them so that we may remember what they were, when the next war comes.

Padre's Hours were talks or discussions, mostly weekly, between the members of the Forces and the clergy of the various denominations. Catholic troops were addressed by their own priests. There was no fixed programme of any kind, and only the sketchiest outlines of what was desirable were given by the powers above. It is for this reason that I wish to put down what happened in my own experience. It may not be of much importance. It may be quite different from what happened elsewhere. But, from repeated experience in a busy spot for some four years, a number of "probable conclusions" can be drawn which may be of interest. I would prefer not to classify these conclusions too formally, but to let them appear in a general account.

Nearly all my Padre's Hours took place in a "dangerous area". I never knew, until the very last moment, whether they would take place or not; and even when they had begun, it was possible that enemy action would not allow them to proceed to a dignified conclusion. Circumstances, therefore, decreed that our meetings should be free and easy in tone, and this was a great advantage. Only in a proper barracks and with a large number of men did I ever hear a Padre's Hour which was a set and formal occasion. On gun-sites and in Nissen huts, with everyone smoking and distinctions of rank for the moment tacitly unstressed, discussions often became most interesting, and very revealing. On one occasion, a Major came to apply the closure to a meeting

which had developed into a first-class and enthusiastic argument. To everyone's delight, he fell into temptation and joined in, and our hour stretched on into two.

But, before we could have our Padre's Hour, it had to be arranged. And no mean task it was. A.-A. batteries were the most disconcerting in their habits, and would steal away silently by night, leaving the chaplain a deserted village to preach to, or, worse still, a completely new and strange unit. Infantry units were more static; their excuses had not the devastating unanswerableness of those the A.-A. batteries could adduce; and the Adjutants could always be cornered. Those poor men! The Infantry Adjutants were presented with more dilemmas in a day than an ordinary priest meets with in a week. By sheer persistence, one could always fix the day and time for a Padre's Hour. Whatever trouble one had to go through was compensated by the knowledge that the announcement in "Orders" would be worth looking at. For some unknown reason, Adjutants seemed to find difficulty in devising the appropriate formula. It might be: "17.30 hrs. *The R.C. Chaplain (Officiating) will inaugurate a series of lectures on Roman Catholicism and its relations to the duties and obligations of Citizenship. All R.C.s will attend,*" etc. Or it might be (the formula which pleased me most): "14.30 hrs. *R.C. CHAP: (N.A.A.F.I.).*"

In the end, one always managed to get the Catholics together. The next question was what to say to them. The many Chaplains I have spoken to on this matter are not agreed. In my case, unit followed unit very rapidly and it seemed wiser to concentrate on the Sacraments and Commandments, and then to go on to other matter if the unit remained. Then, too, I found that there was a very marked difference between the Catholics from different parts of the country. A "London crowd" needed more plain instruction than, say, a group from Glasgow. The Pioneers were older and steadier Catholics than the majority of, say, the Infantry battalions. Out of a mass of varied items of information which accumulated over years, I pick one detail for mention. I found that the number of "Ne Tem.s" exceeded the number of mixed marriages. It may be that this is not generally true, but it was checked elsewhere by one or two other priests, and they found the same state of affairs. At any rate, the "Ne Tem." problem is a serious one.

When meeting a new unit for the first time, I found that the most successful introduction was to hold a kind of self-imposed examination on the Sacraments in general. The procedure was

some eighty to a hundred questions from me, many so simple that everyone knew the answers and was, in consequence, more ready to argue the point when a more difficult question appeared and mistakes were made. By the repetition of this questionnaire over months and with all manner of troops, it is possible to say which are the most persistent errors of the ordinary Catholic man with regard to the Sacraments. The two important ones are, first, the effect of concealing a mortal sin in confession, and, secondly, the validity of marriage in the church and outside the church. On this latter point (again checked by other chaplains) there is most definite confusion. The distinction between "*in the eyes of the law*" and "*in the eyes of the Church*" is one which is clear enough to a priest. But, although it was constantly used by the men, it seemed to have little connexion with the validity of the Sacrament, but only with a kind of formal recognition of it. One very well-instructed Sergeant told me that he was continually arguing about this question and he had found very few indeed who really understood it.

When we came to the Commandments, we found plenty to discuss. The first three Commandments were fairly straightforward. It was the fourth Commandment which roused the men to speak their minds, and gave me an insight into the deep anxiety which Catholic parents are now suffering over the upbringing of their children. By the time we had got to this problem the men and I were fairly well acquainted. They knew I would listen, and that is practically all I did. That is practically all the younger men did too, except to stiffen a little now and again, and to forget to smoke. If I were asked whether all the trouble and wasted time and difficult journeys which Padre's Hours sometimes entailed were really worth while, I would answer that they were all nothing in comparison with the lessons these ordinary men taught me. We priests talk so much about the modern breakdown of family life, but I doubt if we have more than the faintest inkling of the pain and heartbreak that people suffer. I watched the young men still in their teens, and knew they were listening to the truth. It is an experience like this, repeated half a dozen times with different groups of men, which makes one wonder whether "Youth Groups" and "Youth This" and "Youth That" are any real substitute for the old game of Happy Families.

Of the other Commandments, two only need be mentioned. Contrary to what I had expected, the Sixth Commandment did

not show much misunderstanding. Stealing, however, touched a raw spot, and there is no doubt that dishonesty is a prevalent sin. I made a note of one man's most ingenious method of squaring his conscience. It appears that he would take what he wanted (machined parts, toothed wheels, etc.) from the scrap-heap, and, when on leave, collect an equal weight of broken metal and donate it to salvage. It was tit-for-tat, and he claimed truly that all he took from the scrap-heap would have been cut or mashed up for remelting. I present this case, free of charge, to those who compile our conference cases.

It was often my fate to lose a unit before we had finished the Commandments. I had, however, other units more permanent. With these, I covered a great deal more ground. Saints' lives were far more appreciated than I had ever expected, and I owe a real debt to Fr. Martindale's *What are Saints?* Social questions were just not popular. Perhaps it was my inability to make them interesting; perhaps, in the unstable state of things, the problems of social morality are far too complicated for the ordinary man (the Army Education officers would agree); perhaps our English presentation of these problems is uncommonly stodgy. But it was only rarely that we got any fun or interest out of our social studies.

What else did we discuss? The Mass, at length. In connection with this subject, may I mention how few of our Catholic men know how to serve at Mass. The Americans shame us in this matter. On one of their sites, I asked for a server and a forest of hands went up. The next Mass I said was in one of our own chapels, and nobody seemed able to answer. I doubt if it was shyness, for I explained the position fully, and then had to say the responses myself.

Sermons we spoke of also. This was a great opportunity for the men to tease me, and they did. By sifting answers continually, I now believe that most people would sooner have a Sermon at Mass than not have one; that five-minute sermons are not at all popular; and that, if all the signs are propitious, even half an hour is tolerable. Aiming at safety, I stay at twenty minutes.

We talked of the Pope, of the Church, of Angels and the Devil. We talked of nearly everything which could fairly be called proper matter for a Padre's Hour. I enjoyed it all.

When an official history of the last war comes to be written I doubt if Padre's Hours will even be mentioned. They will undeservedly join the host of deservedly forgotten things. (Does any-

one remember the amazing letters to the clergy, sent by post in the early days of the war, from the Minister of Information?) But Padre's Hours had their value. They seemed to have begun spontaneously, from the very need there was of them, soon after Dunkirk. I know, at least, that they were in existence long before they became official.

Now they seem to be disappearing. Perhaps the very human urge which may have prompted them has died, but I think the need of them remains. Year by year, thousands of young lads will be called to the Forces. Already, reports are disquieting, and the return of so many of the Regular Chaplains is leaving hundreds of men without a priest.

My own Padre's Hours are finished. But, at the back of some Catholic Church or other, stands a group of silent men who once were not so silent. I wonder if they will ever talk again?

K. T. L.

CLERICAL LEARNING IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

A RECENT writer in *THE CLERGY REVIEW* has shown that pre-Reformation sanctity has been sadly under-rated.¹ The same can be said of the professional learning of the mediaeval parish priest. More often than not, he is credited with "incredible" ignorance: at the abyss of which "we may well stagger".² It is implied that the Church either could not, or would not, provide competent pastors for its flock. These long-dead members of the pastoral clergy are our predecessors in office. To defend their memory is a work of filial piety. These pages are intended to suggest (mainly from thirteenth-century evidence) that their intellectual attainments went somewhat beyond the proverbial muttering of Mass.

Let us begin with clerical examinations: the traditional safe-

¹ Rev. G. J. MacGillivray: "Sanctity in the Fifteenth Century", in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, March 1946.

² Dr. Coulton, *Mediaeval Village* (Cambridge 1925), p. 258; *Mediaeval Studies*, 1st Ser. (London 1915), p. 70.

guard of professional competence. No one denies that the mediaeval clergy had to submit to this ordeal. But it is commonly held that the standard was absurdly low and the process a mere formality.¹

Frequent reference to examinations is made in thirteenth-century institution rolls. They appear to have been anything but a formality. One candidate, after repeated summoning and failure to appear, was given three examinations, two at Leicester and one at Peterborough: after which he was rejected—not without ceremony: “fecimus (eum) per viros fidedignos examinari, et cum omnino repertus esset insufficiens, ipsum multis et magnis viris nobis tunc assistentibus tanquam indignum sententialiter repulimus”.² Another, after a first failure, was given a second chance and promised institution “si . . . iterum examinandus per scholarum frequentationem in litteratura competentiori et psallendi addiscitione inventus fuerit idoneus”.³ A “near-pass” might be admitted with the obligation of further examination: “et veniet idem vicarius singulis examinandus qualiter profecerit”.⁴ To such injunctions is often added the threat that in case of insufficient progress the incumbent will be deprived of his benefice: and subsequent vacancies show that the threat was carried out.

Prescribed subjects are also mentioned in the Rolls. “Litteratura”, of course, occurs frequently. How far this was from being elementary Latin may be seen from a letter of Grosseteste, dated *circa* 1235. He rejects a candidate as “litteraturae minus sufficientis, puer videlicet adhuc ad Ovidium epistolarum palmam porrigens”.⁵ Something more than elementary Latin is also to be expected from candidates who (as shall be shown) were sometimes told to attend the schools for periods of up to seven years. “Cantus” is mentioned less frequently. Failure in this subject alone seems never to have been a bar to institution,

¹ So Dr. Coulton, *Mediaeval Panorama* (Cambridge 1938), p. 145. He suggests that the prescribed subjects were mainly elementary Latin grammar and the reading of music. He also cites Giraldus Cambrensis as twice condemning the examinations as a farce. Reference to his sources hardly bears this out. In the first citation (*Gir. Cambr. Opera*, R.S., iii, p. 234) the examination is described of a Welsh abbot nominated to the episcopacy. In the other (*ibid.*, p. 368), Giraldus gives express testimony to the value of examinations in England. He complains that Celtic Bishops ordained candidates “reprobatos in Anglia et pro indignis habitos et ubique recusatos”.

² *Rotuli Hugonis Welles* (Lincoln Record Soc.), ii, p. 224.

³ *Ibid.*, i, pp. 19–20.

⁴ *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste* (Lincoln Record Soc.), p. 36.

⁵ *Rob. Grosseteste Epistolae* (R.S.), p. 156.

A knowledge of the Sunday Homilies was, on the other hand, essential, one candidate being enjoined "quod omnes omelias domenicales sciat infra annum sub pena privationis beneficii".¹

Theological subjects are mentioned less frequently: but there is evidence that the standard required did not fall below the level necessary for the instruction of the people. It is set forth in a circular of Grosseteste dated *circa* 1238. "Firmiter injungimus ut unusquisque pastor animarum et quilibet sacerdos parochialis sciat decalogum. . . . Sciat quoque quae sint septem criminalia . . . sciat insuper, saltem simpliciter, septem ecclesiastica sacramenta; et hi qui sunt sacerdotes maxime sciant quae exiguntur ad verae confessionis et poenitentiae sacramentum, formamque baptizandi . . . habeant quoque quisque eorum saltem simplicem fidei intellectum, sicut continetur in symbolo, tam majore quam minore, et in tractatu qui dicitur *Quicunque vult* . . . Omnes quoque pastores animarum et sacerdotes parochiales, finitis in ecclesia divinis officiis, orationi et lectioni Sacrae Scripturae diligenter intendant, ut per scripturae intelligentiam, sicut ad eorum pertinet officium, parati sint semper ad satisfactionem omni poscenti rationem de spe et fide".² This letter appears to have been equivalent to the then examination syllabus. One candidate is ordered "veniet ad festum Sti. Michaelis plenius examinandus super x prec'. vii sacramentis, vii cri' cum circumstantiis".³ In modern language, he had to undergo examination in dogmatic and moral theology and liturgy.

It appears, then, that before a candidate was admitted to a parish he was subjected to an examination which was systematic, serious, and sufficient to prevent the intrusion of an unsuitable priest. What training did he receive in order to reach the pass standard? "It seems evident," says Dr. Coulton, "that the great majority of mediaeval parish clergy attained to priesthood very much as a guild apprentice obtained his mastership, by practice and rule of thumb."⁴ Practice and rule of thumb are hardly likely to produce a competent clergy. Let us see how far this theory is born out by the evidence.

The institution rolls recognize only one method of training: that of the regularly constituted school. Unsatisfactory candidates are never sent back for a further period of apprenticeship: they

¹ *Rot. Rob. Grosseteste*, p. 402.

² *Rot. Rob. Grosseteste*, p. 416.

³ *Rob. Grosseteste Ep.*, pp. 155-6.

⁴ *Mediaeval Panorama*, p. 143.

are sent to the schools. One candidate is sent for about a year;¹ another for seven years;² another "quamdiu domino Episcopo placuerit".³ A vicar instituted to Barton-on-Humber in 1219 was ordered to attend the theological school at Lincoln for two years.⁴ Even the poorest class of church-student—the villein's son—was unable to by-pass the school-system. To school he had to go, and his father paid cheerfully the fines exacted on this occasion by the manorial courts.⁵

The foundation of ecclesiastical education was laid at the then ubiquitous grammar-school. This was organized essentially as a junior seminary. Its curriculum catered exclusively for the church-student. It was only in the early fifteenth century that a "modern" side was introduced by Abp. Thomas Rotherham in the Jesus College of his native town, precisely because there were "many youths endowed with light and sharpness of ability who do not all wish to attain the dignity and elevation of the priesthood".⁶ It appears from this that every boy who attended a grammar-school was at least presumed to have the intention of proceeding to ordination. Their numbers have been estimated at ten per county; and to have been each attended "not by units but by scores".⁷ Presuming a seven-year course, this would give an annual output of about 2000. This is nearly five times the number required to replenish the ranks of the parochial clergy, who in thirteenth-century England numbered perhaps 13,000. Given the capacity and purpose of these schools, there can be no doubt that every mediaeval priest (with extremely rare possible exceptions) had at least received as good an education as a grammar-school could give him.

And this education was of no mean quality. The curriculum is well known and remained almost unvaried from the days of Aelfric at Winchester in the tenth century to Wolsey's model foundation at Ipswich in the sixteenth. It led from the elementary Latin of Donatus in the first year, through graduated reading of authors and practice in prose, to the composition of Latin verse in the sixth or seventh year. Some grammar-schools actually conferred a baccalaureate—the typical qualification for which was

¹ *Rot. Rob. Grosseteste*, p. 402.

² *Ibid.*, p. 14.

³ *Rot. Hug. Welles*, ii, pp. 52-3.

⁴ Leach, *Schools of Mediaeval England* (ed. 1916), p. 156.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 206-7. These fines are not to be considered as penalties imposed to retard popular education. They were taxes to compensate loss of inland revenue by boon-work. Governments must live.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 271-2.

⁷ Leach, *op. cit.*, pp. 271-2.

ability to compose twenty-four verses a day on a single subject as in the fourteenth-century college of Bredgar. The finished product was a man of liberal education. He might be still ignorant of many things, but he was an educated man.

Graduation from the grammar-school commonly took place at the age of 14 to 16. Some eight years had to pass before ordination. There are three opinions current as to the use made of these years. The "rule of thumb" theory has already been mentioned. Dr. Rashdall considers that "the bulk of the inferior clergy" must have been educated at "schools in connexion with cathedrals or other important churches"; these "taught a full course of logic as well as grammar, and in some cases perhaps the whole range of a university arts course".¹ Cardinal Gasquet takes the view that "the student's preparation for the reception of Orders was continued and completed at the Universities".²

One known fact is the proportion of priests who spent their eight years at a University reading for a magisterial degree in arts. Of the 143 holding livings in the Archdeaconry of Leicester at the time of Grosseteste's death, and who had been instituted by him, seventeen were M.A.s: a proportion of about one in eight. Holland Deanery, at the same moment, shows a proportion of almost one in two. For the whole country, one in six may be taken as a reasonable approximation. All these men had passed through a course of seven to eight years comprising Grammar, Rhetoric, Arithmetic, Geometry, Music, Astronomy, Logic, Natural Philosophy, Morals and Metaphysics.

These figures provide the basis for a further calculation. Apart from those who completed the course, many more spent three to four years at the University without graduation: perhaps in the proportion of two to every graduate.³ This would suggest that, in all, one-half of the English clergy had been to a University; one-third of these staying the whole eight years, and two-thirds leaving after three to four years of Logic and Natural Philosophy.

To appreciate the training of the remainder of the clergy, we must bear in mind that two currents of educational theory met in the thirteenth century. On the one hand the priest was the heir to the traditions of the Roman civil service. These included

¹ *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1936), p. 349.

² *Parish Life in Mediaeval England* (London 1906), p. 76.

³ Rashdall (op. cit., p. 329) estimates that, at Paris, out of 270 who matriculated in the French nation in 1447, only 80 would graduate.

the theory of the *cursus honorum*—by which he had to learn his profession by exercising it in a series of increasingly responsible ministries. He could continue his training while serving a parish as deacon or sub-deacon, and was expected to become fully competent only after some years in the priesthood. On the other hand there was a growing tendency to abolish, to all practical purposes, the office of deacon and sub-deacon, and to concentrate the church-student in embryonic seminaries. Grosseteste crystallized this theory in the dictum "*Ad regimen animarum non probandos sed probatos debemus admittere*".¹

Canon law demanded that there should be a resident deacon and sub-deacon in every parish of sufficient means. It is impossible to say exactly how many parishes were able to fulfil this provision. A deacon's stipend was commonly one mark per annum and his keep; the sub-deacon receiving half a mark.² Such indications as we have suggest that these ministers were maintained in much the same localities as were important enough to have a grammar-school. If this is correct, it will follow that one quarter of the clergy were trained while exercising a subordinate ministry.

This was, in effect, training by apprenticeship. It does not follow that it was training by "rule of thumb". Many of these deacons and sub-deacons were in large towns where they could attend schools of divinity; many more could attend schools of logic such as were attached to large grammar-schools at Newark in 1238 and Southwell in 1248; all were within reach of such private tuition as could be given by the master of the local grammar-school. Thus we hear of one student who remained on the rolls of Beccles grammar-school for the whole nine years preceding his ordination.³ As a rough estimate, we can say that the proportion of clergy trained outside the University and episcopal school system was probably one in three. And only very rare exceptions would be left entirely without some form of academic assistance.

The Lateran Council of 1215 had decreed that each cathedral church was to maintain a lecturer to instruct priests and others in the *sacra pagina* and pastoral theology. The quality of the instruction given may be inferred from a decree of Honorius III

¹ *Rob. Grosseteste Ep.*, p. 53.

² Thus at Bakewell in 1280 (Cox, *Churches of Derbyshire*, ii, p. 7).

³ Leach, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

dated 1219, by which he gave a general licence for canons to retain prebends while residing for five years in theological schools with a view to holding lectureships. It has been maintained that the schools founded under these decrees were "small at the best and probably often dormant".¹ There is considerable evidence for their size and activity. Only a steady demand for divinity professors can explain the large supply. The University doctorate of divinity meant not that a student was qualified for the priesthood; but that he was qualified to teach theology. And the output of D.D.s was not small. Two per year would have been enough to maintain one in every county of England. Probably ten or twenty times this number were turned out yearly by the Universities serving this country.²

If episcopal schools of divinity were rare, small or dormant, there can be no full explanation of the urge which led so many, after graduation in arts, to plod patiently through a further nine to ten years in search of a D.D.

Lincoln certainly had a school of divinity that rivalled Oxford. When the discriminating Giraldus Cambrensis wished in 1198 to take a higher course of theology, his first choice fell on Lincoln, where Willelmus de Monte was then lecturing.³ Other schools of divinity probably existed in such large non-cathedral towns as Northampton and Stamford, which had University status in 1238-65 and 1333-37 respectively. How many attended this type of school is not known. But if Lincoln had, on a four-year course, thirty; and Northampton and Stamford had fifteen each, it would have been enough to train fifty per cent of the Lincoln diocese. Smaller numbers would hardly have justified the maintenance of a lecturer; and larger would be suggested by the analogy of the 3000 student population of Oxford.⁴ The curriculum of these schools would almost certainly be that pursued by the professor in his first four years at the University. These years, in thirteenth-century Oxford, were devoted to the Bible and the *Libri Sententiarum*.

A good education costs money. The training of the mediaeval clergy would be open to suspicion if it could not be shown that

¹ Coulton, *Mediaeval Panorama*, p. 143. But Rashdall (*Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, p. 349) holds the more favourable view.

² This estimate is obtained from Rashdall's calculation (op. cit., p. 330) that for every seventeen Arts students there were approximately ten in the higher faculties.

³ *Giraldus Cambrensis*, *De rebus a se gestis*, lib. ii, cap. iii.

⁴ Rashdall, op. cit., p. 328.

the necessary finance was available. There is little room for doubt on this point.

The responsibility for providing education fell not, as today, upon the Bishop, but upon the patron. The patron appointed the parish priest: therefore he provided him ready-made. At the same time he could draw for this purpose upon the normal revenues of the livings in his hand. The church-student was legally *pauper* and therefore had a claim on tithes and oblations. *Clericus pauper* seems, in fact, to have been the normal mediaeval term for "church student". Urban VI's Bull of 1 June, 1378, founding Winchester College, describes it as a college for "seventy poor scholars, clerks"; and from the Winchester statutes of 1400 it is clear that *pauper* does not connote indigence, but merely the lack of an annual income of more than five marks.

A share of the parish revenue might be conferred by various legal arrangements. In his synod of 1287, Bishop Quevil of Exeter notes that "Holy Water Benefices" (i.e. the revenues appropriated to the parish clerk) had been instituted to aid ecclesiastical education, and were to be held by church students in all churches not more than ten miles distant from the schools of the diocese. By this means, almost every parish in the country could maintain a boy at the nearest grammar-school. Another form of grammar-school bursar was available at religious houses, cathedral and collegiate churches. Each of these maintained a number of almonry boys. These were primarily choristers, but also went through the normal grammar-school course. At Lincoln there were twelve boys living practically in modern seminary conditions; with a common house from 1264 and their own endowments. Ultimately the funds from these burses derived from the parish revenues: much of which had passed by impropriation into the hands of monastery, college, or cathedral chapter.

For higher education a more direct tax was laid on parish revenues. The institution rolls show that the student was sometimes made rector of a parish; not without the obligation of paying a vicar to discharge his parochial duties. They show also that many students were assigned a *simplex beneficium* of three to six marks from the fruits of a definite living "*quamdiu . . . privilegio clericali gaudens in addiscendo profecerit*".¹ Resident deacons and sub-deacons had obviously sufficient provision. There is also a strong presumption that each class of patron maintained a

¹ *Rot. Roberti Grosseteste*, p. 141.

clientèle of church students, taking an interest in them from the first signs of a vocation till the moment of ordination. This is the only explanation of one constant feature of the institution rolls: patrons almost invariably presented priests born within their patronage. Lay-patrons presented their own relatives, or members of allied noble families. Religious houses filled their livings with candidates born in one or other of their impropriated parishes; sometimes their choice fell on a priest born not in their patronage, but on one of their estates; sometimes the priest came from a living in the hand of another house or nunnery of the same order. The client-relationship is almost always there.

Not enough is yet known to give a full account of ecclesiastical education in the thirteenth century. But a fair approximation to the truth seems possible. As soon as a boy showed signs of a vocation he became the client of a patron. He attended a grammar-school until he reached the age of sixteen or more. From there, one in every six would pass on to the University until ordination. Two more out of six would spend four years at the University and then continue at local schools of divinity. One more would reach these schools after some four years in the subdiaconate. The remaining third would get what training they could locally in the places where they occupied the position of subordinate ministers. When they considered that their training was complete, they went to their patron and were presented to the next living that fell vacant. Before the care of souls was committed to them, they were examined by the Bishop or his delegates. It was possible for an unqualified priest to obtain a living only by some legal evasion: the incompetent priest was an uncanonical intruder.¹

The weaknesses of this system are obvious. It was far from being under episcopal control. Too much emphasis was laid on a liberal, and too little on a professional education. Ideas of ecclesiastical education change with the times. In the later

¹ Dr. Coulton claims that "the ignorance of many mediaeval clergy, as described, or statistically recorded by their own superiors, is almost incredible. In 1222, out of seventeen priests serving dean and chapter livings under the cathedral of Salisbury five were found unable to construe even the first sentence of the first collect in the Canon of the Mass" (*Mediaeval Village*, p. 70). Worst of all, "no measures were taken to get rid of any of these priests" (*Mediaeval Studies*, 1st Series, p. 70). Reference to his sources shows that these five had been intruded uncanonically without presentation. One was suspended, two more were ordered to be replaced by "good chaplains". All were at the very foot of the ecclesiastical ladder, occupying obscure curacies in remote chapels-of-ease where, if anywhere, they might have escaped notice. This they failed to do. When the time of visitation came round, these clerical beach-combers were automatically ejected.

Empire, the priest had been pre-eminently a *rhetor*. In the Middle Ages he was essentially an administrator of the sacraments. Since the Reformation he has been trained, for good or ill, as a ready controversialist. But the needs of the people, and their mental capacity, have not varied so greatly with the centuries. And it is these factors that condition the intellectual furniture of the priest in his years of maturity. If we could look into the mind of a thirteenth-century parish priest, we should most probably find much the same degree of professional knowledge as is common today. He would take his place without undue difficulty in our deanery conferences. A fuller knowledge of our mediaeval predecessors would surely reveal that in all essentials they were very like ourselves.

G. D. SWEENEY

THE OFFICE OF LECTOR

IN recent discussions on Dialogue Mass a statement made on 28 January, 1943 by Radio Vatican was frequently quoted, saying that the Holy See encourages the reading of the Scripture lessons, from the pulpit in the vernacular, while they are being read from the altar by the celebrant (in Latin), seeing in this a modern restoration of the ancient office of lector.

A survey of the tradition of this office has been given by Fortescue in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. Fr. Leclercq's article "Lecteur" in *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* does not attempt to trace the history of the lectorate beyond the first centuries. Fr. Wieland's study on the genetic development of the minor orders (Rome 1897) is concerned with the canonical position. There is therefore still room for a study of the texts traditionally prescribed for the ordination of lectors, their historical background and the teaching contained in them on the duties of the lector.

This study is a sequel to an earlier article of mine on "The Office of Cantor".¹ I pointed in that article to the ancient tradition of the psalmistate's being the lowest of the nine ranks of the hierarchy.² In an early English Pontifical Ordination starts with the words: "How many ranks are in the hierarchy?"; the answer is: "Eight: the first the doorkeeper, the second the psalmist, the third the lector, etc."³ Up to the thirteenth century there was a great variety in the order of the lower orders, though the present order according to which the lectorate is found following upon the ostiarate appears already in the fourth century. The close association between psalmistate and lectorate, as expressed by the English Pontifical, is testified to by numerous other documents. The preface to the final blessing to this day found in the Ordination of the lector originally referred to an "order of Psalmist or Lector".⁴ In the ancient Irish monastic church one of the most important points in the education of a cleric was, as we learn from the *Life of St. Ciaran of Clonmacnoise*, "psalmos et alias scripturas legere".⁵

With the Greeks, who have only five orders, the lectorate is the lowest order.

It appears that at no time the lectorate implied the obligation of celibacy. At present this order has lost much of its importance, as the deacon has obtained the office of reading the Gospel, and in the West the Epistle has become the privilege of the sub-deacon. The two mentions still made of the lector in the Roman Missal (in the general rubrics for the Mass and in the rubrics for Good Friday) are normally without practical significance.

Yet apart from the bishop, priest and deacon, the lector is the oldest of the clerical degrees. The early Church preserved the Jewish custom of deputing to this office for every service an adult (male) member of the congregation. Justinus the

¹ *Music and Liturgy* (1942), xi, 49-56.

² A reference to this idea is made in the Irish Litany of Jesus (ed. Plummer in *Bradshaw Society*, vol. lxii (1924), p. 30 f., where Jesus is entreated "by the nine orders of the Church on earth from the psalmist to the episcopate"; these nine orders are compared with the nine orders of the Church in heaven. The psalmist as the lowest rank of the hierarchy is also mentioned in the *Brehon Law Tracts* (iii, (1873), p. 72, line 14).

³ Martène, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus* (Bassani, 1788), ii, 37.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 38. An illustration of how the relationship between psalmistate and lectorate was discussed before the revival of studies in the history of the liturgy is the *Tractatus de Sacramento Ordinis in Probatia Piscina* by Augustine Gibbon de Burgo, an Irish Hermit Augustinian (Würzburg, 1687), ii, 68 f.

⁵ Plummer, *Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1910), i, 205.

Martyr mentions that the lector sometimes added a short exposition of what he had read (the actual sermon however was reserved to the bishop). From the third century on the lectorate became a fixed office. One and the same person retained it for a certain period or even for lifetime.¹

Tertullian rebuked the heretics for the disorder in which they allowed the lectorate to fall: "Hodie diaconus, cras lector; hodie presbyter, cras laicus". The high esteem in which the office of lector was generally held was due to the fact that it required a person of some culture, who could not only read, but read fluently and intelligently. St. Cyprian recommends Aurelius, a young man of whom he cannot say anything better than that he has held the office of lector. St. Augustine says that the actual ordination of the lector should take place after he has acquired sufficient experience.

Since the fifth century the clerical character of the lectorate became more marked. It became an institution, comparable to our seminaries. The reading of the lessons, if not the actual office of lectorate, was frequently entrusted to gifted boys. Epiphanius tells us of a five-year-old lector; another writer refers to lectors as *infantuli*. The second and third Council of Vaison described it as a custom at that time prevailing in Italy, that all parish priests kept "junior lectors" in their household so long as they were unmarried. When they had come to age they were given the choice either to marry (and retain the office of lector) or to go on in the clerical career.² The *Dunstan Pontifical* says that to have "held out in the continuous performance of the lectorate up to the twentieth year of life" is the usual preparation for the higher orders. In the later Middle Ages the seminary-like character of the lectorate was emphasized by the appointment of the deacon as *primicerius lectorum* or *rector scholae lectorum*. Already the *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII (fourth century) provided

¹ Of the various ancient tombstones with inscriptions referring to lectors the one (described by Leclercq) of the lector Petrus may be specially mentioned, as it was found in the vineyard of the Irish College at Rome.

² St. Barre's pupils had to "take three lessons (*haicechta* or *hechta do legadh*) every day until they were ordained". (Plummer, *Bethada naema n'Erenn*. (Oxford, 1922), i, 16.) In Michael Banim's novel *Father O'Connell* (London, 1842), an account of Catholic life in Ireland during the last stage of the Penal period, we hear of the training of teachers for tolerated schools. They were selected from the scholars at the age of about sixteen to be promoted, in virtue of their learning and good conduct, to the position of "priest's boy". "After proving under the priest's own roof, until the boy was a boy no longer, his confirmed morality and exemplary behaviour, the priest then appointed him head teacher" (p. 72; p. 152 ff., an illustration of the relations between the priest and his "boy").

that the lectors should receive a share in the dues, "in honour of the prophets" (Esdras was, as we shall see, regarded as the prototype of lectors), while still earlier the *Canons of Hippolytus* demanded special vestments (now surplices) for lectors.

In the Celtic Church the office of lector was held in particularly high esteem. In the Irish Penitential, known as *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis* (eighth century), book V deals with the lectorate, giving extracts from Isidore's *De ecclesiasticis officiis* II and the text for the ordination of lectors according to "Synodus Romanus".¹ One of the Continental Penitentials, framed after the Irish collections, contains the prescription: "Mulieribus, i.e. Christi famulabus, licitum est in suis ecclesiis lectiones legere".²

Prof. Lawlor said that "the office of *ferleighinn* (reader) was unknown in Ireland before the arrival of the Danes."³ However, already for the year 804 the *Annals of Ulster* refer to an abbot as "bonus lector".⁴ Lawlor translates "*ferleighinn*" by "professor", as it appears that in Celtic monasticism the lector was the leader of the intellectual life of the community. "Between 925 and 1000 the obits of twenty-three of such 'professors' are recorded" in the Irish Annals, "and in the 11th century more than fifty. In the greater number of cases the *ferleighinn* is associated with one of those seats of learning which is known to have been most prolific in scholars." Moreover, it appears that the office of *ferleighinn* was no longer regarded as merely a lower rank in the clergy, but as an outstanding office, ranking with that of "scriba", and frequently associated with that of bishop and abbot. An office peculiar to the Irish Church was that of archlector (*ardferleighinn*), a word which suggests that this was the prefect of the various lectors associated with a monastic community. While the *ferleighinn* was apparently both lector and lecturer, the *ardferleighinn* seems to have been something like a prefect of studies.

¹ Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung* (Leipzig, 1885), 23. Compare also *De Statu Ecclesiae* by Gilbertus of Limerick, one of the chief documents of the Reform in the 12th century Irish Church (P.L. 159, col. 999): "Lectorum est aperte et distincte in ecclesia omnia praeter Epistolas et Evangelia legere."

² Wasserschleben, *Bussordnungen* (Halle, 1851), 209.

³ Introduction to *St. Bernard's Life of St. Malachy* (N.Y., 1920), p. xvi. See also Eoin McNeill, *Phases of Irish History* (Dublin, 1920), p. 284 f., and James F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland* (N.Y., 1929), i, 11.

⁴ Compare the words "Bene legit et bene didicit in diversis scripturis" in the *Life of St. Carthage* (Plummer, *Vitae*, i, 174).

Many traces of the early history of the lectorate are still to be found in the liturgical texts prescribed for the ordination of lectors. These texts, found in the *Roman Pontifical*, consist of four parts: The initial address by the bishop, the delivery of the book, the *Praefatio Lectorum*¹ and the final blessing. These four parts may be distinguished in the ordination of each of the seven orders. The first two parts are expressly mentioned in the *Ancient Statutes of the Church*, formerly ascribed to the fourth Council of Carthage (or, by the *Hibernensis*, to "synodus Romanus"):

"When a reader is ordained, let the bishop speak about him to the people, pointing out his faith, life and skill (*ingenium*). After this, while the people are looking on, let him give him the book, from which he is to read, saying to him: 'Receive this and be *lector* (or: *relator*, a word which Fortescue renders by "spokesman") of the Word of God, and thou shalt have, if thou performest thy office faithfully and usefully, a part with those who have administered the Word of God.'"

The subject of the initial address is now no longer the qualifications of the new lector but rather the obligations of lectorate in general. It appears that the fact that the address was originally concerned with the individual lector is not only a sign that only one lector was ordained at a time, but also that he was elected rather than appointed. His election had to be justified before the people. We shall see that there are still clearer traces of the election of the lector.

Addresses dealing with individual lectors were naturally of no general significance, and accordingly no such addresses have been preserved. In the final Blessing, as long as it was said in the singular, the name of the new lector used to be inserted.

In later years lectors were appointed by the bishop and ordained (in cathedral churches) in groups. The initial address was then concerned with the "faith, life and skill" required for the lectorate in general. In many of the mediaeval Pontificals we find for the initial address a form different from that given by the *Roman Pontifical*. Martène quotes,² for example, from a Rouen Pontifical the following form:

¹ Martène, op. cit., p. 52.

² Ibid., p. 19.

"The lectors are given the power to read in church the words of the sacred law and of the prophets. It is their duty to follow up by good works what they announce with their mouth, and to excel their fellow-men in all things which they preach. The tradition of this order goes back to the Old Testament, where we read: 'Esdras the scribe stood upon a step of wood, which he had made to speak upon' (II Esdr. viii, 4). He stood on a step of wood so that he may be higher than even the tallest amongst his audience, while in his life he should excel his fellow-men in the imitation of Our Lord's Passion. Whosoever instructs his fellow-men by his good life, he performs the office of lector. Our Lord Himself exercised this office when 'going into the synagogue, the book of Isaias the prophet was delivered unto him'."

The final reference to Luke iv, 17 was already found in the prescriptions made on the lectorate in the *Ancient Statutes of the Church*, while the reference to Esdras occurs in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, VIII, 2. The elevated position of the lector was of special importance at the early time of which St. Cyprian speaks when he refers to the lector's audience as "omnes circumstantes" (an expression well known from the *Commemoratio pro vivis* in the Canon of the Mass). To this day, in some countries on the Continent, the congregation stand not only when the Gospel is read, but also during the Lesson.

According to the bishop's address prescribed by the *Roman Pontifical*, the lector's office is "to read for him who preaches and to sing the lessons, and to bless the bread and all new fruit". (The last office was assigned to the lector not until the tenth century, by the *Ordo Romanus vulgatus*, which was written in Germany, where such blessings of victuals were in special favour.) The expression "lectiones cantare" points again to the overlapping between the lectorate and the psalmistate. In the ancient Church the lector read all lessons, including the Gospel. The first Council of Toledo seems to have deprived the lector of the right of reading the lessons from the New Testament. The *Roman Pontifical* does no longer define the range of Divine readings assigned to the lector, but the Ordination of the Deacon makes it quite clear that the right of reading the Gospel is reserved to that order, and similarly the Order for the Ordination of the Subdeacon ends with the delivery of the *liber Epistolarum*.

The words used in the Rouen Pontifical "quod ore annuntiabi-

tis, bonis *operibus* compleatis" are obviously derived from ancient Postcommunion-prayers, such as that of Thursday after Passion Sunday (since the fourteenth century also used in the Ordinary of the Mass): "Quod ore sumpsimus, pura mente capiamus" or that of the Epiphany: "Quae celebramus officio, mentis intelligentia consequamur." The corresponding words in the *Roman Pontifical* show no longer that classical parallelism. The three members of the sentence: "Quod ore legitis, corde credatis, atque opere compleatis" correspond to the sequence "verbo—cogitatione—opere" in the *Confiteor*, combining the petition for internal or spiritual sincerity (as expressed in the prayer "Quod ore sumpsimus") with that for external or practical sincerity¹ ("quae agenda sunt videant et ad implenda quae viderint convalescent": Collect of Sunday within the Octave of the Epiphany).

The spiritual or mental sincerity of the lectorate has a very definite significance. Leidrardus, in the ninth century, said that the lectors must not only exercise the office of reading but also "in divinorum librorum meditatione spiritalis intelligentiae fructus consequantur". It is characteristic of the sense of reality of the Roman liturgy that the *Pontifical* traces back this spiritual necessity to its natural foundation. The lector has to read the lessons "distincte et aperte" "ad aedificationem fidelium", "lest through his carelessness the truth of Divine readings should be corrupted". The Word of God must be handled with similar care as the Incarnate Word in the Blessed Eucharist.

A similar interlinking between the natural or sensual and the spiritual or intellectual spheres is found in the (late mediaeval) Blessing of Statues and Pictures for churches:² "Quoties illas (imagines) oculis corporis intuemur, toties . . . memoriae oculis meditemur." The bishop's address to the candidates for the lectorate in the *Pontificale Romanum* ends significantly, saying that the congregation are edified not only by listening to but also by looking at a worthy lector.

Similarly the practical sincerity of the lector is of special importance. Of all the minor orders he occupies the most exposed position. "While the people are looking on", he is ordained, and he is specially assigned to an elevated position in the church. The *Roman Pontifical* makes no reference to Luke iv, 17 or to II Esdr. viii, 4 (such Biblical references are characteristic of the

¹ See my article on "Sincerity" in *Orate Fratres*, February 1944.

² See my article on "Art and Liturgy" in *Liturgical Arts*, February 1946.

Gallican liturgy); it gives the elevated position of the lector a strictly spiritual, rather than a historical, interpretation. Thus it emphasizes the teaching contained in the words "quod ore legatis, corde credatis atque opere compleatis". The lector must combine physical (or vocal) efficiency with intellectual and spiritual understanding of what he reads, backed by an exemplary life. The parallelism existing between this conception of the lectorate and the classical teaching (restored by Pope Pius X) on Church music is evident.¹ There can be no real edification when, however sincere and "holy", the reader lacks the elementary vocal qualifications. But still more it is true that even the most accomplished reader, when lacking in spiritual sincerity, is nothing but sounding brass. No generation realizes better than ours that "everyone who instructs his fellow-men by his good life is a real lector", and that nothing is more detrimental to the advancement of the Kingdom of God in this world than the disproportion so often found in Christians between theoretical teaching and beliefs, and practical realization. At no time, perhaps, has alienation from the Church been more widely justified by the suggestion that "they do not practise what they believe, and they do not believe in what they are speaking of".

The address to the candidates is followed by the bishop's delivering the book to the new lectors, saying to them: "Receive ye and be lectors!", as we saw, found already in the *Ancient Statutes of the Church*; the plural came into use, in this and the following texts, when mass-ordinations became the general rule. The book is now no longer actually delivered to the new lector, but merely touched by the various candidates in succession. In many mediaeval Pontificals this part of the ceremony was concluded by what was known as the *Pronuntiatio*² or *Advocatio*:³

"Thou hast been elected by thy brethren to be a lector in the house of Thy God, and that thou mayest recognize thy office, in order to perform it properly, God is mighty, may He increase His Grace in thee."

In some cases these words actually took the place of the ancient words: "Receive and be . . .";⁴ the fact that the lector was

¹ A parallel to the words "Receive this and be lector" is found in the Blessing of the Organ (see my article in *Music and Liturgy* (1941), x, p. 113 ff.): "Rejoicing in spiritual canticles on earth. Thy faithful may deserve to come to eternal joys in heaven." For the parallelism between the hierarchy on earth and the hierarchy in heaven see note 2, p. 519.

² Martène, pp. 70 and 83.

³ Ibid., p. 75.

⁴ Ibid., p. 68.

elected rather than appointed was thus strongly emphasized. It was apparently under the influence of this *Pronuntiatio* that in the subsequent *Praefatio* to the final Blessing the words "*Oremus, dilectissimi*" were changed into "*Oremus, fratres carissimi*":

"Let us pray, dearly beloved brethren, to God the Father Almighty that He may mercifully bestow His blessing upon those His servants, whom He hath deigned to assume into the office of lectors, that they may distinctly read what is to be read in the church of God and fulfil it by their works."

The "brethren" here referred to are the people in whose presence the ordination takes place, and to whom the bishop renders an account of the lector's qualities. St. Cyprian¹ speaks of an address held on this occasion starting with the words: "*Hunc, fratres dilectissimi, a me et a collegis qui praesentes aderant, ordinatum scitis.*"

The custom of proposing to the faithful the intention of the subsequent prayer by a *Praefatio* is very old; outside the order for Ordination it is also preserved in the Solemn Supplications of Good Friday. According to what is known to liturgists as Fortescue's Law, such very ancient features are most faithfully preserved in the liturgy for occasions of special solemnity.

The *Praefatio Lectorum* establishes once more quite clearly the sequence from the natural foundation to the practical realization of the office of lector: "*Distincte legant, quae in Ecclesia Dei legenda sunt, et eadem operibus impleant*", words which obviously date from a time when the lector had still to read all the lessons—that is, of both the Old and the New Testament.

The final Blessing² refers to the lectors as "*assiduitate lectionum instructi, atque ordinati*". Though punctuation in the Pontificals varies, we may attribute some importance to the comma before "*atque*". The words "*instructi, atque ordinati*" (which remind of the "*moniti, et . . . formati*" in the Preface to the *Pater* in the Canon) were substituted for the words "*distinctus atque ornatus*" (no comma, as these two words are equivalent),

¹ DACL, viii, 2243.

² "Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Eternal God, deign to bless these Thy servants in their office of lectors, that instructed in zealous performance of their office and ordained, they may say what is to be done and fulfil by their works what they say, so that in both their words and their works, they may take Holy Church as the example of their holiness." So far as I know, this text has never before been published in an English translation.

originally found in this instance. In the ancient Church it was, as we have seen, after a period of practical probation that the lector was definitely appointed to his office. In later years he was trained, privately, so to say, before he was allowed to exercise his office in public, and he was not admitted to this office without actual ordination. (There is an analogy to this in the history of apprenticeship in secular trades: The ancient custom of training the apprentice in the employment of a master is more and more superseded by the training in professional schools.) The change in the words apparently coincided with the change from singular to plural. On the other hand, the grand parallelism of the subsequent phrase "et agenda dicant, et dicta opera impleant" is still expressive of the high antiquity of this text.

At first sight, the lectorate, unlike all the other ranks of the hierarchy, is concerned with words rather than with actions. However, each of the four texts prescribed for the ordination of lectors contains the summons "to fulfil by his work", "fulfil" namely the true significance of his office, which is practical in the true sense of the word. At the same time, the Church never loses out of sight the technical function of the lector's office. It is through the harmony between his voice and his works (*in utroque*) that he gives an example of sanctity.¹

It is interesting to see that in the Greek Church (where laymen have never ceased to perform the office of lector) we find exactly the same teaching on the various aspects of the lectorate. The following prayer, transmitted to us through Goar's *Euchologium*, may be regarded as a summary of the teaching held on the office of lector by the Church Universal:

"Grant, O God, that he may devote himself to the meditation upon and the reading of Thy Divine Word with all wisdom and understanding, and follow it with stainless life. He has to read daily the Holy Scriptures in such a way, that the listeners, in Thy sight, become edified."²

JOHN HENNIG

¹ Martène's *Ordines*, iv and vi, have in this place "a curis modulis spiritali devotione gratiae resonent ecclesiae", words which seem to be associated with those found in the Blessing of a Church Bell: "cum melodia auribus insonuerit populorum, crescat in eis devotio fidei". The change to the present-day form is made, e.g. in Martène's *Ordo*, ix (Salzburg; op. cit., p. 61).

² Martène, p. 95.

A SAINT OF THE MONTH

OCTOBER 3RD—ST. THOMAS OF HEREFORD

THOMAS CANTILUPE, Bishop of Hereford in the thirteenth century, is in the curious and interesting position for a canonized saint of having been solemnly excommunicated shortly before his death by his metropolitan, the Archbishop of Canterbury, himself a man with a considerable and deserved reputation for holiness. The Archbishop described him as a wolf in sheep's clothing, a perjurer, a contumacious rebel, and various other uncomplimentary things, but King Edward I who had known him intimately told Pope Clement V that he was the walking embodiment of all Eight Beatitudes, and Pope John XXII finally estopped Canterbury's charges in A.D. 1320, by raising him to the altars of the Church, the last Englishman to be so honoured until the apotheosis of St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More in our own day. "Natione Anglicus, angelicus homo ipse," wrote the Pope in his Bull, plagiarizing St. Gregory the Great. Plainly, we have here the elements of a very good story if we could disentangle them and enter a little by an effort of sympathetic understanding into the peculiar psychology of great mediaeval ecclesiastics. At any rate, we can try.

As his surname vaguely indicates, Thomas was of Norman blood. Some writers have seen in it visions of a field and a wolf, *Champ de Loup*, but that derivation belongs probably to the wonderland of puns and heraldry. In the world of fact, the Cantilupes came over with the Conqueror and received from him for services rendered generous portions of England's green and pleasant land. Several of the family are commemorated in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, e.g. Grandfather William, the first Baron, who stood by and even encouraged King John in all his iniquities, was his seneschal, and likewise sheriff for the counties of Warwick, Leicester, Worcester and Hereford, with his residence at Kenilworth Castle, a bold, bad Baron of the original vintage; his son William, the second Baron and father of St. Thomas, a chip of the old block who found great favour with the young Henry III, abetted him as his father had abetted his father, held the Great Seal for a time, and was appointed guardian of England during the King's absence in 1242, altogether an unpromising parent for a saint; Walter, the younger brother of the second William, an eminent and excellent churchman, though an inveterate pluralist, who became bishop of Worcester, and reversed the family tradition of royalism by acting as spiritual director of the barons in

their revolt against Henry III, "with the exception of Bishop Grosseteste . . . decidedly the greatest bishop of his time".¹ Our Saint's mother, Millicent de Gournay, had been married to Almeric de Montfort, Earl of Evreux in Normandy and of Gloucester in England, before she became the wife of Cantilupe, and so Thomas was a relative-in-law of the famous Simon de Montfort who triumphed at Lewes and fell at Evesham. Other marriage alliances connected him with the Marshalls, Fitzwalters and a few more illustrious heirs of 1066.²

St. Thomas came into this world at the little Buckinghamshire village of Hambleden, three miles north-east of Henley-on-Thames, where the Cantilupes had one of their numerous baronial mansions. Most probably that event took place in the year 1218, an ill-starred date when the country was seething with discontent owing to the presence of hordes of rapacious foreigners and to the exactions of hard-pressed impecunious Popes, at grips with the Hohenstauffen. Thomas had four brothers, among them an elder one, Hugh, afterwards Archdeacon of Gloucester, who shared most of his thoughts and ideals, and three sisters who were not permitted to share anything with him, even a roof over their heads at night. However, as they all married barons they stood in no great need of his hospitality, but he might have been more civil and fraternal towards them without any particular damage to his angelhood. He used to say that women's talk was silly, and he never let any of the girls give him a sisterly kiss, even when their tears pleaded for such a small token of family affection.³ In this

¹ Walter was an intimate friend of Grosseteste, as well as of Adam Marsh, which by itself is proof of his quality. The article on St. Thomas in the D.N.B. was entrusted to the most accomplished of mediaeval historians, Professor Tout. The tiny Warwickshire village of Aston Cantlow is the only geographical memorial of the family now remaining.

² The best and, in many respects, the only source for the life of St. Thomas is the long account (166 folio pages in double columns) compiled from the process of canonization by the Bollandist Constantine Suyskens and published in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Octobris t. i, Antwerp, 1765. A century earlier, the English Jesuit Richard Strange, who figured prominently in Titus Oates' accusations and spent some lively months evading pursuivants, brought out an enthusiastic life of the Saint in his native tongue (Ghent, 1674). This remains the only life of him ever written in English, which is curious seeing that he enjoyed a pre-Reformation popularity second only to St. Thomas Becket's. Father Strange's book contained enough charm of style, though not nearly enough honest, hard facts, to merit republication in the "Quarterly Series" in 1879. Valuable additional, confirmatory or corrective information is to be found in *A Roll of the Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, Bishop of Hereford*, published in two volumes by the Camden Society in 1855. Swinfield was one of St. Thomas's closest friends and succeeded to his dignity. The most interesting and astonishing documents about the Saint are contained in the *Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis*, edited in three volumes for the Rolls Series by Charles Trice Martin, London, 1882-5. Many of the Chronicles published in this Series also refer to our hero, but not very helpfully. None of his own writings appear to be extant, except two letters given in Peckham's Register and Webb's abstract of Swinfield's Roll.

³ *Acta Sanctorum*, Octobris t. i, p. 553.

respect, we may fairly say, he wore his halo somewhat askew. During his childhood he was cared for by "a devoted, noble and saintly matron", and she, rather than his mother, appears to have laid the foundations of his holiness. His father and mother do not come into the picture at all and he never speaks of them, though they did their duty at least to the extent of paying others well to look after him. Perhaps that was the custom among the nobility of Angevin times.

At the age of seven, Thomas was delivered over to an able and conscientious tutor who grounded him thoroughly in classical learning and also fostered in him a deep devotion to Mass and the Divine Office. While still small boys, he and Hugh used to attend the singing of the entire Office daily at some religious house, and many years before they became priests took to saying it privately on their own account. No doubt they also hunted, hawked, fished, and, let us hope, romped, like other boys of their age and station, but of this we are told nothing. As Oxford at the time was no place for two earnest students bent on improving their minds,¹ they went to Paris instead and there set up house in some style, with an imposing retinue of tutors, chaplains and domestics. The contrast between their condition and that of Richard de Wyche, starving in an Oxford garret a little earlier, is interesting, though far less uncommon than might be imagined, and shows that saints can make the most of any circumstances. St. Thomas used his chances to befriend people of St. Richard's class. He would have as many as thirteen poor students to dine with him daily, and embarrassed professors also, such as the great John Peckham, who afterwards excommunicated him, gratefully acknowledged his benefactions. When his ready money failed, as it often did owing to his boundless liberality, he used to beg for his distressed dependents from affluent people in his own circle. So he advanced in grace and learning, like Shakespeare's winter, frosty, at least towards women, but kindly. In due course he took his Master's degree, and in 1245 proceeded to the first General Council of Lyons, whither his father had been dispatched by King Henry to protest against the exactions of the Roman Curia. Pope Innocent IV, then in the thick of his great struggle with the portentous Frederick II, had come to the Council at the peril of his life, and our Saint very probably listened with awed attention while he

¹ Town and Gown riots were endemic. On St. George's Day, 1238, a Welsh undergraduate shot dead with an arrow the brother of the recently arrived Papal Legate, Cardinal Otto, who immediately put the University under an interdict, suspended all lectures, cast thirty masters into prison, and excommunicated the Chancellor, Simon de Boville, O.P. Matthew Paris, O.S.B., who detested foreigners only less than he did the Mendicant Friars, tells the story with immense gusto and a quotation from Ovid (*Chronica Majora*, vol. iii, Rolls Series, 1876, pp. 481-4).

pronounced his moving opening discourse on the "Five Wounds of the Church", namely, the sins of the higher and lower clergy and the spread of heresy; the aggression of the Saracens who had again captured Jerusalem; the schism of the Greeks and their attacks on the Latin Kingdom; the savage invasions of Christendom by the Tartars; and the persecution of the Church by the Emperor.¹

Very likely St. Thomas was ordained by the Pope at Lyons, and it is certain that he there obtained from His Holiness the rather peculiar favour of a dispensation to hold several benefices simultaneously, a right which he afterwards freely used. But we must not be too quick to raise shocked eyes to heaven, for Thomas was a pluralist of no ordinary kind. Two motives inspired him, first, as a good Englishman to keep foreigners out of English benefices, which at the time was a sorely needed reform, and secondly, to instal in the livings poor native clerks of proved worth whose services might otherwise have been lost to the Church. He always kept a most vigilant eye on his appointees, and his pluralism, like that of his saintly and patriotic uncle Walter who undoubtedly inspired it, resulted in nothing but good to souls. Walter, who superintended his education, seems to have been his ideal in matters ecclesiastical, and he could hardly have chosen a better model, even though the good Bollandist concerned with the nephew is reluctant to admit the uncle's sanctity and reputed miracles on account of his support to the Barons in their revolt against Henry III. Belgian Jesuits of the eighteenth century had a strong sense of the subject's duty to his prince under practically all circumstances. Another very good friend and counsellor whom Thomas discovered during his university career was the Domini-

¹ This outstanding Pope, one of the greatest in history, has been very harshly handled by historians, Catholics no less than others. Thus Canon Barry, following tamely in the wake of that cross-grained bigot, Matthew Paris, who attributed everything Innocent did to a greed for gold, wrote of him in his *Papal Monarchy*: "To speak of Innocent with respect for his person would be in defiance of the multiplied proofs which exhibit him as grasping, cold-hearted, insincere, and a nepotist" (p. 347). For Innocent's enemy, Frederick, on the other hand, Canon Barry, who was an excellent priest but too prone, it seems to me, to play up to his Protestant audience, has nothing but tenderness: "The Alcibiades of the century . . . he sleeps with his royal robes about him in the Cathedral at Palermo . . . truly a spirit misunderstood, never wisely handled, full of mysterious charm and powers wasted, the most captivating, enigmatic, and unhappy of Christian Emperors" (p. 350). As against that pleasant rhetoric, the searcher for truth should read the calm, factual, thoroughly documented pages of Monsignor Mann, who devoted the entire fourteenth volume of his *Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages* to Innocent the Magnificent. By a misprint of almost prophetic implication, Canon Barry's preface is dated "Dorchester, 9 November, 1001." Mgr. Mann's volume appeared in 1928. The truth is that Innocent saved the Church, at infinite cost to himself of danger and misery, from complete domination by the Hitler, not the Alcibiades, of the thirteenth century.

can, Robert Kilwardby, an eminent professor at both Paris and Oxford, destined in due course to be the first friar—and how Matthew Paris hated it!—to sit on the throne of St. Augustine at Canterbury. Thomas chose this excellent unworldly man, who ended his days in Rome as a cardinal, for his confessor and spiritual director. Many years later it became Archbishop Kilwardby's pleasant task to induct his penitent as Chancellor of Oxford University, on which occasion he covered him with confusion by publicly announcing before all the robed dons and hilarious clerks that, to his certain knowledge, their new ruler had never stained his baptismal innocence.¹

The thirteenth century, the age of Bracton, was a great time for the study of civil law, a discipline, however, forbidden to clerks in orders. But our Thomas, a jurist born and "valde legalis", as his brother reported of him, obtained a second dispensation from Innocent IV to spend some years at Orléans, the foremost centre of juristic learning, where he progressed so rapidly through the dark forest of the codes that he was frequently invited to deputize for his professor. Thence he returned to Paris to plunge enthusiastically into the jungle of canon law, and was honoured in the midst of his labours, austerities and charities by a visit from no less a person than King St. Louis IX. About the year 1257, he took up duty as professor of canon law at Oxford, and five years later was elected Chancellor of that turbulent University. An undergraduate who was there during his period of office, Hugh Barber, testified as follows in the process of his canonization: "Valde bene regebat Studium Oxoniense, et valde bene puniebat scholares delinquentes." But his severity was tempered by his never-failing charity, which made allowance for the high spirits of youth and only confiscated its weapons when they became a menace to life and limb. Even so, we are told, his house at times resembled a small arsenal, so full was it of bows, arrows, swords and daggers. His period as Chancellor coincided with the beginnings of the national revolt against the misrule of Henry III, and, following the example of his uncle Walter, the intimate friend of Simon de Montfort, he cast in his lot with the Barons. It says something for his influence and popularity at Oxford that the whole University went over to the same side. When Henry's son, Prince Edward, later the great King Edward I, approached the City in 1263, the students in a body demanded to be allowed to sally forth and attack his camp. The Chancellor sternly refused and had all the gates locked and guarded, whereupon the bold spirits, thirsting for a fight, stormed a wine-shop, became up-

¹ *Acta Sanctorum*, Octobris t. i, p. 552.

roariously drunk, and started one of the worst Town and Gown riots in Oxford's history.¹

At the end of the year, St. Thomas, probably to his relief, was chosen with a few other eminent men to speak for the Barons at Amiens, where St. Louis had agreed to arbitrate in England's controversy. Henry and Prince Edward were there, too, as well as Henry's wife Eleanor, sister of the Queen of France. Even a saint's judgement could hardly escape being warped in the presence of so much majesty, and Louis pronounced entirely in favour of his brother monarch. The Barons repudiated the award, sprang to arms, and by the great victory of Lewes on 14 May, 1264, became the masters of the Kingdom. St. Thomas was then elevated from being Chancellor of Oxford to being Chancellor of England, in which high post his justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude, and incorruptible integrity made him acceptable even to the defeated King. But he did not hold the Great Seal long. Evesham followed swiftly on Lewes, which meant the return of the *status quo* and disgrace for Earl Simon's supporters. Thomas retired to Paris and forgot politics in theology. Three years later he was back in Oxford, which for a second time elected him its Chancellor. It is significant that no action of any kind was taken against him by the triumphant royalists who were far from being paragons of magnanimity. At this time he began a sort of apostolate of his various benefices, renovating the churches and preaching with great love and zeal to the humble parishioners, not a man of whom was half as humble as himself. On the poor and the sick he lavished his wealth like water. Though extremely ascetic himself, he liked people to make merry on suitable occasions and organized literal "bean-feasts" for his numerous spiritual sons and daughters on the Church holidays which were so frequent in the mediaeval calendar. Each, we are told, received at his expense enough corn, peas and beans "to satisfy a horse after its daily toil".²

In contrast to those charitable activities, our hero, who was

¹ Wood, *Historia et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis*, Oxford, 1674, t. i, p. 111. The editor of Strange's life of St. Thomas, following the mediaeval chroniclers who believed in giving good round numbers, asserts that he had 20,000 students under him. In fact, as Rashdall shows, the number, with servants included, never in mediaeval times exceeded 3000. The Saint's action on this occasion may partly account for the excellent relations between himself and Prince Edward, who afterwards, as King, reckoned him among the most trusted of his advisers. Once, the King sent for him very early in the morning to discuss some urgent business. But it was the hour of his Mass, and to all the pleading and pressing of the royal messengers his only answer was: "The King of Heaven comes first, and you can tell your Master that I said so, if you want to." Edward was big enough to accept the admonition in good part (*Acta Sanctorum*, Octobris t. i, p. 605).

² *Acta Sanctorum*, Octobris t. i, p. 550. It may sound like "austerity" fare, however liberal in quantity, but it was what the commoners of England liked in those days, and what St. Thomas himself lived on year in and year out.

not a fine lawyer for nothing, engaged in much litigation with various aggressive prelates who trespassed on the rights of his parishes. But the biggest lawsuit of his life, a regular Tichborne case, was directed against himself. Though the details are not very clear, it seems to have been largely a matter of English versus Foreigner, a common source of trouble during the reign of Henry III. A former Burgundian bishop of Hereford had presented one of his countrymen, Pierre de Langon, with a stall in Hereford Cathedral and the living of Little Wenlock in that diocese. The next bishop, an Englishman, ejected the foreigner on some unknown pretext and gave both benefices to our Thomas, evidently hoping thus to secure his succession in the see. But Langon was as bonny a fighter as Thomas himself and at once commenced a suit against him in the Roman courts. Meantime, in 1275, the bishop died and Thomas was unanimously chosen by the Hereford Chapter in his place, on which occasion, instead of restoring Langon, he presented the vacant benefices to two other Englishmen. Langon continued his suit in Rome. "It lingered on through more than sixteen tedious years, and passed through many hands. Auditors and proctors and Popes disappeared, but still the cause of 'Langon versus Cantilupe and others' survived. Innocent V, John XXI, Nicholas III, Martin IV were no more. Then came Honorius IV in whose time Cantilupe himself went to his rest. At length when Nicholas IV filled the Papal chair, the prosecution came forth with redoubled vigour, and, forasmuch as, in the language of the lawyers, 'no process could or ought to be taken against the dead', it was directed against the executors of Cantilupe's will, Richard de Swinfield and William de Montfort."¹ Judgement went against them on every count and they were mulcted in heavy damages, which, however, the victorious and generous Langon remitted, being content with restoration to his long-lost dignities.

As Bishop, St. Thomas's chief contention was with Gilbert de Clare, the powerful Earl of Gloucester, against whose encroachments he carried on a magnificent fight in the English courts for five whole years, even going the length of engaging a champion, at 6s. 8d. a day, to withstand Gloucester in the lists, had the matter warranted an appeal to judicial combat. He won this case, and to the present day there remains as the memorial of his victory the enormous fosse or trench which the infuriated Earl caused to be dug along the Malvern Hills between his property and that of the Bishop. One of the many other trespassers whom the Bishop wor-

¹ Webb, *A Roll of the Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, Bishop of Hereford*, pp. cbcxviii-cbcxxii. The case cost St. Thomas a mint of money and untold anxiety, but, believing that there was a principle at stake, he never contemplated giving in.

sted in the courts, a certain Baron Corbet, said to him at the conclusion of the case: "Either you are full of the devil, my Lord, or else you are a very close familiar of God."¹ Remembering the camel in the Gospels, we would be entitled to think of St. Thomas as one of the Bactrian species, with at least two pronounced humps, his litigiousness and his pluralism, yet he passed through the needle's eye as sweetly and featly as an angel might dance on its point, which is somehow very encouraging.

He was so much a familiar of God that one who served his Mass hundreds of times said he never knew him to get through without abundance of tears. Another who shared his room when he was bishop testified that he used to spend half the night sitting on his bed preparing his sermons by the dim light of an oil lamp, or else on his knees, leaning against the bed in prayer. Of his private austerities, especially in the matter of food, the stories are endless. He had a particular liking for the lampreys of the Severn and would frequently order dishes of them to be prepared for him, but his servants, or "Brothers", as he invariably called them, observed that he never partook of more than one mouthful, after which the fine dish, almost intact, was sent out to some needy family on his list. He played the same trick on his appetite in the matter of game, of which he had abundance on his estates and was very fond. Once, when his chancellor, Robert of Gloucester, an excellent trencherman, was dining with the Bishop, he ventured to expostulate with him on his excessive abstinence, saying: "You eat and drink too little, my Lord; you won't be able to last out." Getting no answer, the bold Robert repeated his remark, whereupon his Lordship retorted with some heat: "You, Sir, eat and drink what you like, but hold your tongue and mind your own business." The same Robert is our informant that the Bishop usually took only one meal a day, consisting of a scanty portion of vegetables or stew. For his supper, when he indulged in it, he allowed himself one slice of bread dipped in beer. Sometimes he would drink a single glass of wine but out of a glass "no bigger than a salt-cellar". He admitted in strictest confidence to his relative and executor, William de Montfort, Dean of St. Paul's,² that for thirty-two years he had never once risen from table less hungry than when he sat down. "Yet, William," he continued, "I am strong enough to take you on in single combat." About his hair-

¹ *Acta Sanctorum*, Octobris t. i, p. 563. Their extortion and usury caused the Saint to be very hostile to the Jews, and he was probably in part responsible for their expulsion from England by Edward I, though that event did not take place until eight years after his death. Edward, as is well known, treated the exiles humanely and allowed them to take all their property abroad.

² This is the William who made himself famous by dying of fright at the prospect of having to preach before King Edward I.

shirt, an inheritance from Uncle Walter which he wore day and night, we are given much information. The man who used to wash and, be it said, de-louse it for him expressed his belief that it was the most fearsome of such objects to be found in all Christendom. When through constant use it lost some of its hardness and roughness, it was regularly sent to a secret address in Oxford to be reconditioned. After the Saint's death, the marks of this instrument of torment were plainly to be seen on his poor emaciated body.

An even more formidable instrument of torment in the Saint's history has now to be considered. After the elevation of his dear friend Kilwardby to the cardinalate in 1278, the Pope nominated John Peckham, O.F.M., eminent pupil of St. Bonaventure at Paris, to the see of Canterbury. Peckham was a fascinating character, a man consumed with zeal, almost as much a lover of poverty as the Poverello himself,¹ boundlessly charitable to the poor, and personally austere as a Desert Father. At the same time he showed himself a pompous, fussy, tactless person, a kind of small-scale Boniface VIII, possessed of an altogether exaggerated and uncanonical opinion of his rights as Metropolitan. The famous Franciscan annalist, Luke Wadding, admitted that he had quarrelled with "practically every bishop in England and with all of them together". Thomas of Hereford was in the field as leader of the aggrieved suffragans from the very beginning, but his personal duel with Peckham did not begin until a little later. The first explosion occurred over a marriage case tried in the Hereford court, from which the losing party appealed, over the head of his Bishop, to the court of Canterbury and was upheld. St. Thomas's official thereupon excommunicated the successful appellant for his irregular action, and was himself promptly excommunicated by Peckham's official. In fact, the air became thick with excommunications, which was one of the crying abuses of that age. In December, 1281, "Friar John, by divine permission humble minister of the Church of Canterbury and Primate of all England", addressed to his "Venerable Brother of Hereford" a letter peremptorily ordering him to publish every Sunday and feast-day in his Cathedral of Hereford and all other churches of that diocese the sentence of major excommunication pronounced on his official, Robert of Gloucester, until notified that the said Robert had sought and been granted absolution. The letter, which, as from one bishop to another, is distinctly offensive,

¹ Kilwardby helped him to practise it by taking with him to Rome for mysterious reasons a good deal of the property of Canterbury! Historians have a grievance against him because he also bore away the episcopal registers, which Peckham tried in vain to recover. They have never come back.

ended with a threat: "See to it that you carry this our order into execution if you wish to avoid canonical penalties."

St. Thomas replied very calmly and courteously, pointing out that the case had gone to Rome, and consequently, *pendente lite*, was removed from both their jurisdictions. But shortly afterwards another cause of contention supervened, this time over a will which the Archbishop claimed the right to administer, though the legal executor, the Vicar of Ross, was St. Thomas's subject. More excommunications then flowed out from Canterbury, until finally St. Thomas, though he, too, anticipating the worst, had appealed to the Pope and notified the Court of Arches of that fact, found himself under sentence and his chapel under an interdict. Peckham's letters to his proctors in Rome and to the Bishop of London, who steadily refused to promulgate the excommunication of Hereford, reveal the full bitterness of that strange man's soul. At the present time, we are often told by preachers and others what scum we are, but with all our iniquities we can claim moral superiority in some respects over the highest ecclesiastics, including the Popes themselves, of the thirteenth century. We do not, as a rule, offer or accept bribes in our courts of justice, and it is as clear as daylight, for their letters remain to prove it, that both Peckham and St. Thomas resorted to such measures, on the revealing plea that otherwise they could not hope to have their cases expedited at the centre of Christendom.¹ Indeed, bribery, or what amounted to it, seems to have been generally regarded in those genial times as a legitimate method of obtaining one's ends, just as forgery, or what closely resembled it, was thought to be no great harm at an earlier stage of Church history. Say the pessimists and *laudatores temporis acti* what they like, we have progressed in some directions.

In the summer of 1282, St. Thomas betook himself to Orvieto, where the French Pope, Martin IV, resided, and, in spite of all that Peckham could do and did to blacken his name, was affectionately received by the Holy Father. Before his case could be investigated he fell gravely ill at Montefiascone from some form of intestinal obstruction that had tormented him for years. He died on 25 August and his bones, separated by some means from the flesh, were brought back to England, where Peckham for a time endeavoured to deny them Christian burial. But Heaven soon intervened between the dead Bishop and Canterbury by

¹ Martin, *Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham*, vol. i, pp. 269-73, 278-9, 299-300, 315-6, 321-2; vol. ii, 393-4; Webb, *A Roll of the Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield*, ii, p. xcvi (St. Thomas's letter to his proctors in Rome, sending them £100 as gratuities for various cardinals and other curial officials). The Bollandist analysis of the whole case is magnificently done (*AA.SS.*, Octobris i, 568-77).

making his sepulchre at Hereford glorious. A few years later, when the number and the magnitude of the miracles could no longer be denied, the poor Primate, grown old and infirm, humbly sent a priest to pray for him at the shrine, and caused himself to be "measured to" the Saint whom he had so grievously wronged.¹ Finally, it is pleasant to record that among the many celebrated men who petitioned the Holy See for the Bishop's canonization was his former arch-enemy, Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester.

J. BRODRICK, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

PHILOSOPHY

ACADEMIC philosophers are apt to regard with suspicion philosophical cults which achieve quick and general popularity, such as that which has recently come to the movement known as Existentialism. The vogue of Socrates ought, however, to be remembered in this connexion, and modern Paris is not unlike ancient Athens in the speedy and eager welcome it gives to new ideas; ideas which are often very fertile. It is not long since Bergson was the fashion there, and Maritain also has had a big following both in France and in this country. Existentialism surpasses these in the popularity it has attained, which has won it notice even in our own penny press. This is perhaps natural, since it is an attitude to life rather than a doctrine, and uses poetry, the theatre and the novel to propagate its views. It ought not, therefore, on this account to be regarded with too much misgiving, especially if it is borne in mind that the end of philosophy is to furnish a way of life, not merely an abstract doctrine; an end which is certainly

¹ This measuring was a very popular mediaeval custom, especially in England, and consisted in having a candle or candles of the same height as the suppliant lighted at the shrine of the saint from whom some favour was hoped. The Bollandist devotes more than a hundred pages to the miracles of St. Thomas, many of which, if we can believe in human evidence at all, are impossible to impugn. A good many of them were cures of poor people's animals, including pigs, which is just what might have been expected from this great lover of common men. The only relic of the Saint now known to exist is the left tibia or shin-bone, ten inches long and in almost perfect preservation, which, by an intricate chain of circumstances, came into the custody of the English Jesuits and is at present the chief treasure of the sacristy of Stonyhurst College.

achieved by Scholasticism when integrated with Christianity, and so worthy to be called in the phrase of Erasmus "the philosophy of Christ".

If we try to state in any formal fashion what Existentialism is we find ourselves in serious difficulty, since it repudiates abstract principles, and refuses altogether to formulate any doctrine. It is an attitude, a method, certainly not a system. In the words of Gabriel Marcel, one of its leading exponents, speaking recently at Louvain: "No one will be astonished to hear me say that not a day passes without someone (generally a woman of culture, but maybe a *concierge* or a tram conductor) asking me what Existentialism is. Nor will they be surprised that I evade the question. I reply that it is too difficult or too long to explain. All one can do is to try to elucidate the key-notion of it, not to formulate a definition."

This difficulty is not lessened by the fact that each Existentialist has a very different view of the nature of the movement from that of every other exponent of it.

It may be convenient if we name in chronological order the chief of those who may be said to be in some sort Existentialists. The movement certainly begins with Kierkegaard, who was followed by Heidegger, Jaspers, Berdiaeff, Chestov, La Senne, Marcel and Sartre. The last two are the most significant at the present moment, and their points of view are totally different.

Jean-Paul Sartre, who was born in 1905, is generally regarded as the high-priest of Existentialism, and can claim legitimate descent from Kierkegaard (though he is not anxious to do so), with his insistence on the necessity of escaping from the abstract, since no abstract conception of existence can ever correspond with what existence is to a free man. It is this distrust of the abstract which is the common theme of all the Existentialists, and it carries with it, necessarily, a refusal of metaphysics. Here we have a dilemma, for without some abstraction no doctrine can be formulated, not even a rejection of abstraction; and for Existentialists to admit abstraction is to deny their fundamental tenet or conviction. This is why they put forward their notions by way of parable in poetry, fiction or the drama. It would seem, however, that this only camouflages their presentation of abstract doctrine, and does not eliminate it.

Their conviction that life lived—and that by a free man—is the only reality, also carries with it the consequence that the Existentialist must be enclosed in his own subjectivity; and it would no doubt be easy to dismiss Existentialism as wholly absurd on the ground that it cannot formulate its doctrine without denying it, and that it leads to subjectivism. Such a summary judgement would be a misunderstanding of its nature, which is an endeavour to express rather an attitude towards life than a logical theory. In a way it seems improper to speak of

"Existentialism" at all as one movement, since the presentations of it made by its two principal exponents, Sartre and Marcel, are so very different.

To get a clearer view it is worth while examining their explanations in a little more detail. Sartre regards Existentialism as an effort to draw the consequences from a coherent atheism. That God does not exist is taken for granted by him; and so far as this goes he is welcomed as an ally by the Marxists. Their alliance, however, is a very uneasy one, as it is a main tenet of Sartre's doctrine that "man is condemned to be free". This freedom is so great that there is no such thing as human nature: no pattern according to which man is formed. His existence precedes his essence, and so man, being born in a definite environment, becomes what he wills to be. We can see here the connexion with the struggles of the French Resistance in which this form of Existentialism had its birth. The Marxist theory of the necessitated action of the godless man has become quite unacceptable to those who have given everything in their struggle against overwhelming forces—all their experience is for liberty. How could their enemies be blamed for their crimes, or their own heroes praised, on the Marxist hypothesis? At the same time some, like Sartre, could not bring themselves to relinquish their atheism, and so are divided against themselves.

Sartre calls his latest and most explicit exposition of Existentialism: *L'Existentialisme est un Humanisme*¹; and as humanism it must be judged not by its abstract certainty but by the test of whether it works in practice, in the sense of providing a man with a solid basis on which he may ground his life at a time of crisis. Sartre's form of it, since it furnishes no irrefragable code of ethics, cannot be said to pass that test. It is satisfied with any conduct which aims at an end which is called liberty, and this detachment from the ground of morality—or what is the same thing, from God—is likely to be its ruin.

Gabriel Marcel's view of Existentialism is not liable to be impugned on these grounds. Though he was brought up without any religious belief his interest was always directed to the question of faith, and at the age of forty, after he had spent long years in analysis of the act of faith and its conditions, it at last occurred to him, it seems almost fortuitously, to make it. He immediately asked for and received baptism.

The initial presupposition of Sartre's doctrine that God does not exist finds therefore no place in Marcel's theories, and with its disappearance many of the inconsistencies and anomalies also disappear. Also Marcel can embrace liberty without any qualms; and his conviction is that if I wish to raise myself above the flux of becoming to the stability of being I can do so by a free participation in an unselfish cause, and by faithful adherence to my vow. Evidently, we are here in a very different

¹ Jean-Paul Sartre: *L'Existentialisme est un Humanisme*. Nagel: Collection Pensées (87 fr.).

atmosphere both intellectually and morally from the nihilistic and pessimistic one of Sartre, which is unbreathable through lack of God and the good.

The master notion of all Existentialism, that existence precedes essence, is of course found in Marcel's doctrine. These terms are not, however, used in their Scholastic sense, for by the essence of man the existentialists mean, not the minimum required to constitute the species but the result of all the determinations which existing man freely develops in the course of his life. It is plain that essence in this sense follows existence, and to make this assertion is only another way of affirming human liberty.

This insistence on liberty is probably the most valuable feature of the new philosophy. Unfortunately liberty, whether in theory or practice, can easily be abused; and in this philosophy we see two opposing tendencies with regard to it represented by our two authors. The first, starting from atheism, makes man isolated in his world, and altogether self-sufficient, and must end in a satanic pride. The second, acknowledging man's interconnection with the rest of the universe, and particularly with God, demands that liberty should be used to make man take his proper place in relation to God and the rest of humanity, and would logically lead to a demand for sanctity.

It is too early yet to form any final judgement as to the compatibility of this new philosophy with Christian thought, but it may well be that it has an important role to play in clothing the logical structure presented by traditional Christian philosophy with flesh and blood. If the two are capable of being united, we should be protected from the subjectivism to which Existentialism tends by the objectivity of the traditional ideas, while the personalism of the new philosophy would give life and vigour to the old truths.

Certainly the tendency of the modern world is to value the concrete above the abstract. It is this which has been one of the chief forces which have promoted the development of physical science, and which science itself, by its successes, tends to increase in the minds of our contemporaries.

Dr. F. Sherwood Taylor has recently given us a valuable essay,¹ in which as a professed scientist he shows that the scientific view of the world, taken by itself, is not enough.

His thesis is that man can see nature in four ways: first, the superficial knowledge of common sense, which gives diversity without unity. From this "man rises through successive stages of integration, first to the perception of the beautiful and its integration in art: next to the apprehension of the order of nature through science and phil-

¹ *The Fourfold Vision*. By F. Sherwood Taylor, M.A., Ph.D. (Chapman & Hall, 6s. net.)

osophy, and the discovery therein of harmony: and lastly the apprehension of the world as made one in its orientation to God".

This fourfold vision is, the author shows, the only complete one, and the tendency, rooted in materialism, which makes men of our time stop short at the third stage, gives them an incomplete and therefore false view both of the world and of man. A chapter of this book is therefore devoted to the examination and criticism of materialism, which is objected to on the ground of its inability to explain mental phenomena. Another class of phenomena which the materialists, and to a certain extent scientists in general, reject, but which are an integral part of the Christian view of the world, are miracles; and Dr. Taylor therefore discusses them at some length. He has been criticized for making them merely events not yet explained by science. It is doubtful whether this criticism is justified, for though there are phrases which seem to have this meaning, they are much modified by the context. Dr. Taylor's whole argument should be read, and is well worth reading, for it is a wise and balanced appreciation of our knowledge.

The last few months have seen the appearance of several interesting books dealing with the history of philosophy. Fr. Copleston has put us doubly in his debt by giving us two books on this subject. One is the first volume of a work dealing with the history of philosophy in general,¹ and the other a special study of the philosophy of Schopenhauer.² To notice the latter first, we find, as we should expect from a Catholic philosopher, that Fr. Copleston exposes the fallacies and radical inconsistencies of Schopenhauer's system. He is not able to credit him with having presented the truth, even if in a distorted form; and this is a serious condemnation coming from so open-minded a critic. He showed his power of appreciating to the full views which are radically opposed to Christianity in his monograph on Nietzsche, but here he can only avow that he made the attempt "to discover beneath the husk a kernel of real value", but was convinced that "it is not possible to do this in any systematic way". Though he admires the beauty of many passages in Schopenhauer's writings, he cannot give him praise as a philosopher on account of his inconsistency.

In his larger work Fr. Copleston rightly points out in his introduction that "no true historian can write without some point of view, some standpoint, if for no other reason than that he must have a principle of selection, guiding his intelligent choice and arrangement of facts". This is the justification for adding one more to the many histories of philosophy, and it is this which gives it its special character since the author is heir to that main current of philosophical

¹ *A History of Philosophy*. Vol. I. Greece and Rome. By Frederick Copleston, S.J. Bellarmine Series. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 18s. net.)

² *Arthur Schopenhauer. Philosopher of Pessimism*. By F. Copleston, S.J. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 12s. 6d. net.)

thought which took its rise with the great thinkers of ancient Greece and Rome. Others have written of them who have been separated from this tradition and so have had to view it from without. It is the special merit of this work that the author is, as it were, able to get inside the skin of the philosophers of the ancient world. He shows how, in spite of many variations, there was steady development in Greek thought from the Ionians to Plotinus. The greater part of the book is devoted, as is right, to the work of Plato and Aristotle, the basis of mediaeval and modern Scholasticism. Since this book is intended by its author for students in Catholic colleges it is natural that he should devote most time and attention to those ancient thinkers whose writings have had the greatest influence on traditional philosophy. This is no doubt one reason why he does not give more space to Plotinus and the Neo-Platonists.

This is certainly a book of outstanding value, which will long be regarded as the standard work on this subject: for it is extraordinarily comprehensive and complete, and gives an understanding and unprejudiced account of all the philosophies of the period with which it deals, whether acceptable or not.

Two books of a more popular character dealing with the history of philosophy have also appeared lately.

Dr. Arthur H. Ryan has published in a small volume some broadcast talks, given in Eire, on some great thinkers of the past, under the title: *Perennial Philosophers*.¹ The philosophers dealt with are St. Augustine, Boethius, Abelard and St. Thomas; with the addition of chapters on the "Origins in Greece" and the "Neo-Scholastic Revival". These talks are written in a graceful and entertaining style, and though they do not profess to give any profound view of doctrine, nevertheless succeed in bringing their subjects to life.

One other small book, which deserves a longer notice than can be given it here, must also be mentioned. It is *A Sketch of Mediaeval Philosophy*, by Dr. Hawkins.² We have here a series of lectures which Dr. Hawkins delivered to the Newman Association. While not professing to be the result of special research, they give us, in a most lucid and interesting fashion, the outline of the main theories in vogue in the middle ages. The book should appeal to a wide circle, for it is accurate, readable and often penetrating in its analysis of the theories it deals with. Duns Scotus, for example, often such a stumbling-block for the beginner, here becomes intelligible and attractive; and the differences between his school and the Thomists are seen to be reasonable, and as is now well known, less radical than used to be believed.

¹ *Perennial Philosophers*. By Arthur H. Ryan, D.D., D.Ph. (Clonmore and Reynolds, Ltd., Dublin. 3s. 6d. net.)

² *A Sketch of Mediaeval Philosophy*. By D. J. B. Hawkins. (Sheed & Ward, 1946. 6s. net.)

An interesting paper on Plotinus has been published by the Aquinas Society.¹ Was St. Thomas nearer to Plotinus than to the "real Aristotle"? is the question asked. The answer, on the whole, is no: for though the influence of Plotinus on St. Thomas was considerable, the main lines of his system were built on the foundation of the great Aristotelian principles.

R. P. PHILLIPS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

FACULTIES "DURANTE BELLO"

For the purpose of determining precisely the cessation of faculties, is the date of the end of the war to be reckoned that of the Armistice or of the formal signature of the Peace Treaty? (D.)

REPLY

(i) The faculties given, or recalled to our minds, in view of the faithful both military and civil being in *danger of death*² ceased with the Armistice: this principle may be deduced from the wording of the faculties, e.g. "milites . . . prout in mortis periculo constitutos" "ne christifideles religionis subsidiis in vitae discrimine destituantur" "liceat sacerdotibus, instante mortis periculo durantibus praefatis (aeris) incursionibus". The rule of the common law at all times permits, when there is danger of death, absolution from reservations, non-fasting communion, and general absolution. These faculties have ceased in principle, though there may still be exceptional classes who are in danger of death owing to their occupation, e.g. minesweepers or those handling unexploded bombs.

(ii) Other faculties granted by a *general indult* during the war, not being necessarily applicable only to those in danger of death, continue until they are withdrawn by the Holy See, e.g. the powers granted to those in internment camps.³

¹ *Aristotle, Plotinus and St. Thomas*. By A. H. Armstrong, M.A. Aquinas Papers. (Blackfriars, 6d.)

² Cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1940, XVIII, p. 304.

³ *Op. cit.* 1941, XXI, p. 54.

Similarly, *personal indults* obtained by army chaplains, e.g. the portable altar privilege or the faculty of granting various blessings and indulgences, cease when the office is relinquished or when they are withdrawn by the Holy See. Faculties of this kind granted during the war 1914-18 were not withdrawn till 1 March, 1919.¹

(iii) *Ordinaries*, through faculties obtained from the Holy See, relaxed the Eucharistic fast in many directions during the war to meet the necessities of the faithful, even when they were not in danger of death. These relaxations varied slightly in different dioceses, and were sometimes promulgated in the Catholic press, sometimes in episcopal communications sent to the clergy. We have never seen the text of these rescripts, but we have the impression that they were papal indults the application of which was left to the discretion of Ordinaries.² The faculty of saying three Masses is clearly of this category. In certain dioceses the clergy have been informed by the Ordinary that faculties granted during the war ceased at the end of 1945; it is for the clergy to obey or ascertain the directions of their Ordinary, whether local or military. Personal indults, however, may still be obtained by nurses and others who find it difficult to observe the Eucharistic fast.

The relaxation of the ecclesiastical fasting and abstinence laws, except for Ash Wednesday and Good Friday, is likewise left to the discretion of local Ordinaries,³ who everywhere in this country, to the best of our knowledge, desire the relaxation to continue.

BRIGITTINE INDULGENCE

What precisely is this indulgence and how is the faculty for imparting it obtained? Why is it not mentioned in *Preces et Pia Opera*? (X.)

REPLY

Only those indulgenced prayers are listed in *Preces et Pia Opera*, for which there is not required either the blessing of some pious object by a priest enjoying the faculty, or a visit to some special pious locality, or inscription in some pious association. Books entitled *Raccolta*, circulating before the first edition in 1929 of the official *Preces et Pia Opera*, used to give a more or less complete list of all indulgences. At the present time, for current and authentic indulgences other than those in

¹ A.A.S., 1919, XI, p. 74.

² Cf. the text of similar indults for Germany published in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1941 (*Jus et Praxis*), p. 6: "... ut pro cuiusque arbitrio et conscientia gratiam extensionis indulgere valeant iuxta petita ...".

³ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, p. 234; A.A.S., 1946, XXXVIII, p. 27.

Preces et Pia Opera, one must consult special pamphlets or leaflets, or else refer to the larger commentaries on indulgences in general, such as those by Beringer or Gougnard.¹

The Briggittine rosary, traced to St. Brigit of Sweden as its originator, consists of six decades with three additional beads; as noted in this REVIEW, 1946, XXVI, p. 44, this is very likely the explanation of the three additional beads found on all rosaries at the present time. The devotion consists of reciting for each decade a *Pater*, an *Ave* ten times and a *Credo*, with an additional *Pater* at the end commemorating the seven dolours, and an additional triple *Ave* commemorating the traditional sixty-three years of Our Lady's life. Meditation on certain mysteries is not required.

From Leo X, 10 July, 1515, to Leo XIII, 8 December, 1897, many papal rescripts have enriched this devotion with ample indulgences, including a plenary indulgence obtainable on certain days by fulfilling the usual conditions, and 100 days for each *Pater*, *Ave* and *Credo*. Unlike the Crozier indulgence,² the one for each bead cannot be obtained, in principle, except by having the intention at least of reciting the whole rosary.

The faculty of blessing these rosaries, originally granted to an Order founded by St. Brigit which is now extinct, is proper to the Canons Regular of the Lateran. It may no longer be obtained by joining some pious association, but must be requested by secular priests through their Ordinary from the Sacred Penitentiary.³ Though a proper form of blessing exists in the current Roman Ritual, n. 39, among the blessings proper to religious Institutes, it may be given by those who obtain the faculty by making a simple sign of the Cross.

AGNUS DEI

What is the specific character of the devotional article known as an *Agnus Dei*, and the indulgence attached thereto? (P.)

REPLY

It belongs to the category of "sacramentals", defined in canon 1144: "res aut actiones quibus Ecclesia, in aliquam Sacramentorum

¹ For the Briggittine indulgence cf. Beringer, *Les Indulgences* (1925), I, p. 457; Gougnard, *De Indulgentiis* (1933), p. 226; Schrevel-Legrand, *Florilegium* (1933), p. 226; *Collationes Brugenses*, 1928, p. 216.

² Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1946, XXVI, p. 214.

³ *S. Poenit*, 20 March, 1933; THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1946, XXVI, p. 316.

imitationem, uti solet ad obtinendos ex sua impetratione effectus praesertim spirituales". There is no indulgence attached.

The *Agnus Dei* is a medallion of wax, taken from the paschal candles used in the Roman basilicas, with the paschal Lamb stamped on one side, and on the other the image of Our Lady or of some saint. A recent one described in *The Catholic Herald*, 18 April, 1946, is dated 1928, the year of its blessing by Pius XI, and is a flat oval disc about the size of a hen's egg; the saint is St. Teresa of the child Jesus. They are blessed by the Pope at the beginning of his pontificate, at intervals of seven years, at the times of Jubilee, and on any other occasion chosen by the Holy Father. Their origin, though very ancient, is somewhat obscure: the fullest account we have seen is that by Fr. Thurston in *The Holy Year of Jubilee* (1900), pp. 247 seq. Blessed Cuthbert Mayne, it will be remembered, was apprehended and martyred through having these sacred objects in his possession. Popular devotion towards them, though at one time widely spread in this country, seems to have diminished in recent times.

The purpose the Church has in mind when blessing and distributing them is contained in the prayers of the rite: remembrance of the Lamb of God immolated for our redemption; protection against evil spirits and the forces of nature such as floods or lightning; the happy issue of pregnancies; in short, preservation from all the dangers attending human life. We have not been able to find the text of the blessing which, being reserved to the Pope, is not printed in the usual liturgical books. Ferraris, *Bibliotheca*, s.v. "Agnus Dei" prints the following verses ascribed to Urban V:

Balsamus, et munda cera cum chrismatis unda
Conficiunt agnum, quod munus do tibi magnum,
Fonte velut natum per mystica sanctificatum.
Fulgura desursum pellit, et omne malignum.
Peccatum frangit, ut Christi sanguis, et angit.
Praegnans servatur, simul et partus liberatur.
Munera fert dignis, virtutem destruit ignis.
Portatus munde de fluctibus eripit undae.
Morte repentina servat, Satanaeque ruina.
Si quis honorat eum, retinet super hoste tropaeum.
Parsque minor tantum, tota valet integra quantum.
Agnus Dei, miserere mei,
Qui crimina tollis, miserere nobis.

ASSISTANCE OF NON-CATHOLICS AT OUR FUNCTIONS

Is there a positive prohibition against non-Catholics taking an active part in the Corpus Christi procession? (W.)

REPLY

S. Off. 20 November, 1850; *Propaganda Collectanea* n. 1840 (altera ed. n. 1053): Se sia lecito porgere torce o lumi accesi a qualsivoglia persona eterodossa che ami assistere alle nostre funzioni? *Resp.* Negative et ad mentem. La mente è che se, attese le particolari circostanze, non possono escludersi da tal cerimonia le sole persone eterodosse, se n'escludano eziandio i laici cattolici.

The laws against non-Catholics attending our rites are far less strict than those which forbid Catholics to assist at non-Catholic religious worship, and they are not always logically coherent: thus one may, for proper reasons, employ a non-Catholic organist who is certainly having an active part in the function, yet in principle, as in the above reply, active participation is not permitted. The justifying reason, apart from those actions which are of their nature forbidden, such as a non-Catholic acting as sponsor at baptism, is the necessity of avoiding the danger of scandal: this would be, particularly in these days, the danger of religious indifferentism, which might affect both Catholics and non-Catholics. Walking in the procession, without performing any office therein, such as server or canopy bearer, should in our view be regarded in the same light as rising and kneeling with the congregation. It is not, properly speaking, an active part in the rite, and is not forbidden, so far as we can discover, by any Roman decision.

PUBLIC PRAYERS DURING MASS

It is perfectly clear from *S.R.C.*, n. 4375, quoted 1946, XXVI, p. 216, that the faithful assisting at low Mass may not recite in Latin with the celebrant those portions, such as the Secrets and the Canon, which the rubrics direct the priest to recite *secreto*. Does this prohibition cover the practice, not uncommon at children's Masses, of reciting in English these same portions? (L.)

REPLY

Canon 20: Si certa de ré desit expressum praescriptum legis sive generalis sive particularis, norma sumenda est . . . a legibus latis in similibus.

S. Off. 11 December, 1850; *Fontes*, n. 913.28: Aux Messes qui ne sont pas chantées nos Chrétiens recitent tous ensemble les prières que nous avons traduites, et qu'on sait par cœur dans toutes les peuplades. *Resp.* Praxim, de qua agitur, laudandum verbis amplissimis.

Propaganda, 23 September, 1773; *Collectanea*, n. 802: Circa la consuetudine per la quale i cristiani in tempo della Messa cantano in lingua cinese il *Gloria*, il *Credo* ecc. si dovrà mandare il decreto del 1755 e la risposta data nel 1759; e si è detto che può tollerarsi che continuino in simil pratica recitando tali orazioni, purchè non contengano errori, *secretamente e privatamente, e non con voce alta e unitamente insieme*. Cf. also n. 805.

S.R.C. 31 January, 1896, n. 3880: An . . . a fidelibus intra Missam cani possunt iuxta antiquum morem . . . preces vel hymni lingua vernacula compositi in honorem Sancti vel Mysteriorum, cuius festum agitur? *Resp.* Affirmative, de consensu Ordinarii, quoad Missam privatam; Negative quoad Missam solemnem sive cantatam.

31 March, 1909, n. 4235.8: Utrum Preces et Hymni liturgici, v. g. Introitus, Communio, Hymnus *Lauda Sion*, a choro musicorum in lingua vernacula cantari possint infra Missam privatam; an vero eiusmodi cantica tantum prohibita sint coram Sanctissimo exposito, ad normam n. 3537.3. *Resp.* Negative ad primam partem iuxta decretum relatum n. 3537.3; ad secundam iam provisum in prima.

(i.) It cannot be in dispute that the various replies of the Holy See relating to what is known as *Missae Dialogatae* have in mind the recitation by the faithful of parts of the Mass prayers in Latin, and it is now clearly defined what is and what is not permitted. The practice has arisen through a desire to participate more closely in the liturgical action by reciting, in common with the server or with the celebrant, certain parts of the Mass. The priest may not use the vernacular in saying Mass; therefore the faithful, in so far as it is permitted, secure the desired participation by using the language of the priest.

Our opinion is that the prohibition against reciting aloud in Latin the parts said by the priest *secreto* must equally apply to reciting aloud these parts in the vernacular. This view is supported by the rule of S.R.C., n. 4235 directed against the practice of singing, during liturgical rites, vernacular versions of the hymns; relying on canon 20, what the law forbids singers must also be forbidden when the liturgical texts are recited in the vernacular. The objection of the Holy See is not to vernacular prayers and hymns during Mass, but to the use of official liturgical texts in a language other than that of the liturgy. Hence Gasparri, citing these and other directions, writes: "Imo vetitum est in Missae celebratione ne fideles alta voce et lingua vulgari dicant Missae preces quae a celebrante, a subdiacono, a diacono, a ministro respondente, a choro recitantur."¹ The reply in *Fontes*, n. 913, must refer, we think, to prayers other than translations of the liturgy.

(ii) Our view of the matter is not, however, shared by some who are most competent to form an opinion. In an article on the use of the

¹ *De Eucharistia*, §851.

vernacular in liturgical functions, Dom Anselm Veys quotes with approval the practice "où les enfants dialoguent en langue vulgaire soit un traduction littérale, soit une adaptation, mais alors avec un catéchiste ou lecteur, non avec le célébrant".¹ The point would seem to be that the faithful using aloud the vernacular of liturgical texts are doing so as a private act of devotion, not as taking an integral part in the liturgical rite itself; and it would, indeed, be the reverse of a common participation in a rite for the celebrant to use one language and the participants another. Hence Gasparri continues in the text above quoted: "(vetitum est) . . . ita ut eae preces, a fidelibus alta voce et lingua vulgari dictae, partem Missae aliquo modo constituent".

From the legal aspect of the matter, it could be maintained, no doubt, that *S.R.C.*, n. 4375, forbids only the recital aloud in *Latin* of those parts said by the priest *secreto*; that n. 4235 forbids only the *singing* of liturgical chants in the vernacular; and that, seeing there is no certain law against reciting such parts in the vernacular, we may do what no certain law forbids. As regards *Propaganda*, n. 802 and other similar directions of ancient date, it must be remembered that in those days the Dialogue Mass had not been thought of, and had not received the qualified approbation it now enjoys. From the non-legal aspect, there is everything to be said for a practice which gets children to know intimately the liturgical prayers of the Mass, and it would seem curious to permit during Mass the recitation in the vernacular of the Rosary or of any authorized prayers whatever, and yet to forbid prayers which the priest himself is reciting.

(iii) The proper solution of the above doubt is for the priest desirous of introducing the practice to have recourse to the Ordinary. The Holy See leaves to his discretion the approval of a Dialogue Mass in its various forms, and if the question we have been discussing is ever submitted to the Holy See, the answer would doubtless be that it is for the Ordinary to decide, as in n. 3880, and canon 1259. A practice which might be admirable at children's Masses could easily become an intolerable abuse at other public Masses. It appears that at least one American bishop sanctions the practice during Holy Week; "Every prayer that is read at the altar is read to the people in English".²

THE ORDINARY AND PAROCHIAL RIGHTS

Certain canons reserve functions, such as Extreme Unction, to the parish priest. Has the local Ordinary a right to perform these functions without any reference to the parish priest? (H.D.)

¹ *La Participation Active des Fidèles au Culte*, p. 150.

² *The Sower*, 1946, April, p. 13.

REPLY

Canon 334, §1: Episcopi residentiales sunt ordinarii et immediati pastores in dioecesibus sibi commissis.

Canon 335: Ius ipsis et officium est gubernandi dioecesim tum in spiritualibus tum in temporalibus cum potestate legislativa, iudiciaria, coactiva ad normam sacrorum canonum exercenda.

Canon 451, §1: Parochus est sacerdos vel persona moralis cui paroechia collata est in titulum cum cura animarum, sub Ordinarii loci auctoritate exercenda.

Although a parish priest has *ex officio* the care of souls in his parish, with the right to exclude other priests when the law so determines, his power is subordinate to the jurisdiction of the bishop and of the Holy See. Whatever a parish priest may do in his parish may be done by the bishop in every parish of the diocese, and by the Pope in every parish throughout the world. The doctrine is a necessary consequence of the fact that the episcopate has the care of souls *iure divino*, and it is implied in the texts of the Pontifical for the rite of ordination and consecration. It was, in fact, not merely a subversion of ecclesiastical discipline, but a serious doctrinal error, when Jansenists taught that a parish priest's care of souls was enjoyed independently of the bishop.¹

The commentators take this doctrine so much for granted that they do not usually refer to it at all when discussing the exclusive rights enjoyed under certain canons by parish priests. It is mentioned, however, by some of them in commenting upon canon 451, §1. Thus Beste, *Introductio*, p. 285: "... episcopus est ordinarius totius dioecesis pastor, qui munus suum in singulis paroechiis immediate explere valet, etiam invito parochus, sive ipse per se sive per sacerdotem specialiter ad singulos casus deputatum . . ." The only limits to this episcopal right are that it should not be exercised arbitrarily to such an extent as practically to destroy the rights of the parish priest. This limitation is stressed, as regards the episcopal right to reserve cases, by Benedict XIV: "... quorum (parochorum) iurisdictio, etsi ab episcopo pendeat, eique subjaceat, non est tamen delegata, sed ordinaria; nec potest, sine legitima causa, aut prorsus auferri, aut adeo imminui, ut fere inanis remaneat".² It is likewise mentioned in *S.C. Conc.*, 14 August, 1863, as regards the episcopal right to delegate a priest for assistance at marriage: "Esse validum: ceterum curandum, ne ob leves quaslibet causas huiusmodi deputationes fiant; salvis semper favore parochi emolumentis, si quae matrimonii occasione dari soleant".³

The objection that sustaining the rights of the Ordinary in this way

¹ Cf. Bouix, *De Parocho*, p. 88 seq.

² *Synod Dioec.*, V, iv, 3; edit. 1844, Vol. XI, p. 121.

³ *Fontes*, n. 4195.2.

means that a parish has got two heads, which is monstrous from a canonical point of view, is well met by S. Thomas, *Supplement*, VIII, 5, ad 3: ". . . inconueniens esset, si duo aequaliter super eamdem plebem constituentur; si autem inaequaliter non est inconueniens. Et secundum hoc super eamdem plebem immediate sunt et sacerdos parochialis, et episcopus, et papa; et quilibet eorum potest ea quae sunt jurisdictionis ad ipsum pertinentia alteri committere".

BOOK REVIEWS

The Mediaeval Idea of Law as Represented by Lucas of Penna. By Walter Ullmann, J.U.D. With an Introduction by Harold Dexter Hazeltine. Demy 8vo. Pp. xxxix + 220. (Methuen & Co. 20s.)

ONE of the most interesting aspects of mediaeval thought is the development of a separate science of political philosophy. Prior to the thirteenth century and the rediscovery of Aristotle, political considerations had little place among the philosophers and theologians. Hugh of St. Victor in the twelfth century made political teaching one of the sub-divisions of moral doctrine. Abelard, following Cicero, foresaw the possibility of a science of the common good, and something of the same idea is in John of Salisbury's *Polycraticus*. But it was not until the mediaeval thinkers were in possession of the *Ethica Nova*, the new translation of the Nicomachean Ethics, and especially the Fifth Book, that the significance of justice in human relations as a virtue *ad alterum* was perceived; and with that the philosophy of politics was born.

In the field of law a somewhat similar situation arose. The barbarian invasions of the fifth century did not as a rule destroy the practice of the Roman Law, at least in the central provinces of the Empire. But Roman Law inevitably decayed. By the tenth century it had become almost a dead letter submerged under the cruder barbarian customs. With the slow recovery of the West, the restoration of some sense of security, the return to organized society, there came also the discovery in ancient manuscripts of the ancient laws of Rome. Thanks mainly to the Italian jurists of the twelfth century the Roman Law as codified by Justinian was reinstated, and for a time its revival seemed as if it might sweep away all trace of custom and the customary laws which the Germanic folk-lawyers had so laboriously established. Bologna, with the great name of Irnerius, became a centre of revived Roman Law.

The "Four Doctors", Bulgarus, Martinus, Jacobus and Hugo, and other disciples followed. The methodical excellence and the fundamental principles of Roman Law exercised an absorbing fascination on these students. So much was this the case that the text of the law became a kind of sacred thing, to be explained but not to be altered. Hence the glosses which were multiplied in the thirteenth century and the emergence of the school of Glossators, culminating in the *Accursiana*, the "Great Gloss of Accursius" which had such an authority that it acquired the standing of a legal text. "*Quidquid non agnoscit glossa nec agnoscit curia*" became the tag. At this stage a hardening and formalizing set in. Jurisprudence tended to fossilize. What the fourteenth century required was a new approach, a new method of jurisprudence which would attempt to adapt the text of Roman Law to the new conditions of society. It has been commonly maintained that the jurists who attempted this work—the Post-Glossators or the Commentators as they are called—were unduly influenced by the dialectical methods of the scholastics, and that to a great extent they stultified their own labours. It is almost a commonplace in the history textbooks that the logic-spinning and hair-splitting of the scholastics was a baneful influence on the jurists, and that it was not until the sixteenth century, when they deserted the narrow path of scholasticism for the broader ways of the humanists, that they made any notable progress in the science and philosophy of law. Cujas the French Romanist is approved in his criticism of the Commentators: "*Verbosi in re facili, in difficili muti, in angusta diffusi.*"

Up to the present time Lucas of Penna, a Neapolitan jurist of the fourteenth century, a barrister and judge who practised in the Sicilian courts, and before his death was in the service of the Roman Curia, has been a secondary light among the galaxy of Commentators which included such distinguished names as Bartolus of Sassoferrato, Cynus of Pistoia, Albericus of Rosate and Baldus of the Ubaldi. Now Dr. Ullmann has presented us with the full-length study of his life and work. It is not too much to say that it is a study of outstanding importance, a contribution to historical knowledge which, if followed up, may lead to a re-assessment of the Post-Glossators and their work, a fresh conception of the fourteenth-century relation between the jurists and the philosophers, and a much fuller appreciation of the contribution of mediaeval scholasticism to mediaeval and to modern jurisprudence.

Dr. Ullmann analyses carefully Lucas's most important work, the long commentary on the *Tres Libri*, three of the chapters of Justinian's Code, and he shows clearly how much Lucas was influenced by the scholastic resurgence of the previous hundred years. Here is a commentary very different indeed from the formal citation and counter-citation for which the Commentators are usually criticized. We see, under the pen of the trained jurist, for the first time in the history of

European jurisprudence, as Dr. Ullmann remarks, the creation of a philosophy of law. Lucas's work is analysed under different headings in separate chapters: "The Foundation and Nature of Law", "Customary Law", "The Application of Law", "The Administration of Law", "The Idea of Crime", and there is a final chapter on "Social and Political Conceptions". It is impossible in a short review to do justice to the careful scholarship manifested in these pages. The subject itself is somewhat intractable, and there are pages which are far from easy reading. Possibly Dr. Ullmann has pushed analysis too far in his desire to lay bare the thought of Lucas at every stage. An attempt at synthesis would have made the book easier to use for the reader who is unskilled in mediaeval jurisprudence, and it might have helped to make clear some of the points on which Lucas himself does not seem to have formed a settled and consistent opinion.

Legal historians will find a wealth of information on the position and function of the judge in mediaeval litigation.¹ Sociologists will be interested in Lucas's idea of crime, and in his almost "modern" notions of penology. He discusses the question of peace and war, and the conditions for a just war. Despite his curial work he is a wholehearted exponent of the absolute authority of the secular ruler, and has very definite views on the relations of secular and ecclesiastical judges, and on the question, hotly disputed at the time, of the obligation of the clergy to pay taxes.

For Lucas the authority of the secular ruler is absolute, and is an authority which comes directly from God. He allows no authority to the people in the making of law, going so far as to maintain that custom has binding force only from the explicit approbation of the ruler. He has no use for prescriptive rights. The ruler's authority is not mediated by the people. It is a trusteeship, "personal, indivisible, inalienable and non-transferable"; and the ruler is not to be thought of as in any way a representative of the people. In fact Dr. Ullmann is able to bring strong support to Professor Ewart Lewis in his contention that in this connexion Gierke failed to understand his texts and has misled many students of mediaeval political thought. Yet it is worth noting that Lucas recognizes not only the supremacy of law, and the principle that "*malae leges servandae non sunt*", but that the tyrannical ruler may be deposed. He is a firm supporter of John of Salisbury in his defence of tyrannicide. The inconsistency seems to be removed by Lucas's doctrine of *publica utilitas* as the end of law. In any case his absolutist teaching seems to have had a big influence on sixteenth-century thought, and especially on the work of Jean Bodin.

Enough has been said to show the importance of Dr. Ullmann's

¹ Lucas rejects the distinction between the "public" and the "private" conscience of the judge. The judge, he maintains, has only one conscience just as he will have to face only one judgement. "*Damnabitur ipse ut ipse*" is his comment.

book. There are points which might require some clarification, but they are mostly of minor importance. Did St. Augustine really believe in the sinful origin of the state? And to what extent is it true to say that the *status innocentiae* of human society is a basic principle of Thomism? Proof-reading has been very thorough so far as one can judge, though there is a quaint misprint on p. 201, which has turned "absolutism" into "absolution".

A. B.

The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker. By E. T. Davies, M.A. Crown 8vo. Pp. xii + 98. (S.P.C.K. 6s.)

A TURNING point in the struggle between the Elizabethan Establishment and Puritanism in England was the appointment of John Whitgift as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583. It was due to him that, two years later, Richard Hooker, a young Devonian of thirty-one, was appointed Master of the Temple in London, and was persuaded to undertake with a group of Anglican lawyers and divines a defence of the Establishment. This was the origin of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* which, after preliminary discussion, was entrusted entirely to Hooker's pen, and appeared in parts, the first four books in 1593, the fifth in 1597, and the remaining three after their author's death.

Hooker's purpose was to establish a basis of authority in religion and in politics different from the scripturism and the individualism of the Puritans. Hence the most important part of his work is concerned with the nature of law and the basis of political obligation. So far as law is concerned he follows very closely the Thomist argument which begins with the eternal law, bases natural law on human reason, and sees the function of positive law as a determination of natural law. Mr. Davies stresses the importance of Hooker's work in keeping alive the notion of natural law in circumstances where it would otherwise inevitably have died out.

On the question of the basis of political obligation, Hooker is a less sure guide. The Puritans maintained that the word of Scripture made civil authority needless, and Hooker replied by attempting to show the natural origin of civil authority. It is not surprising that, in the inconsistencies and stresses of his time, he should show some hesitation in coming to a decision. In consequence there is no clear-cut teaching in his work. He maintains that authority should depend on the consent of the governed, but will not accept out and out the theory of the social contract, the *pactum subjectionis*. His Anglican outlook makes him lean to a patriarchal concept of government, and even to the acceptance of the theory of the Divine Right of Kings.

Mr. Davies has written a useful exposition of Hooker's ideas, but on two points his book is not quite satisfactory. He is clearly conversant

with a good deal of sixteenth-century Puritan literature, but has little acquaintance with mediæval political thought. It is quite erroneous to hold that in the Middle Ages the basis of political power was the *jus divinum*. That might have been the Hildebrandine ideal, but it is not true of St. Thomas or of Scotus, still less of Marsilius or of William of Occam, or of a score of lesser writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Mediæval thought, especially on politics, far from showing a tranquil unity, is a most disturbing tangle of diversity and contradiction.

On a second point Mr. Davies seems inadequate. The fundamental cleavage with the Catholic past at the Reformation was the implicit denial of the supernatural order. Hooker discusses the question in relation to the authority of Scripture in the eleventh chapter of Book I. Although he uses the term "supernatural", he does not indicate anywhere what he understands by the expression, and, for a Catholic reader, some discussion on this point would be a necessary preliminary to an understanding of his thought. Mr. Davies seems to have missed the importance of this, and to have no very clear idea himself of the distinction and relations between the natural and the supernatural.

A. B.

A Son a Priest. By Mgr. P. E. Hallett. Pp. 64. (Douglas Organ. 2s. 6d.)

AT the time of the recent creation of Cardinals, a press reporter tried to discover the reactions of the Australian Cardinal's mother. The old lady said that she was very pleased to hear the news, but not so pleased as she was on the day that her son told her that he wanted to be a priest.

No one in England can be more competent to write on this subject than the rector of Womersley, and he has succeeded admirably in putting the priestly vocation in a new light by examining it from the aspect of the home which produces a priest. From the vocation of the son of Anna in the Old Testament we pass to that of the Son of Mary in the New, the divine plan for perpetuating Christ's priesthood, and the sanctity which this high office demands. It must be plain to everyone that a country gets the kind of priests it deserves, that the level of the priesthood is the level of the families from which it is drawn, and that as a normal rule the Church expects and finds vocations to the priesthood amongst boys brought up in good and sizeable Catholic families. Mgr. Hallett shows Catholic parents, whose dearest wish it often is to have a priest in the family, that the theory of Divine vocation to the priesthood, as expounded by Lahitton and accepted by the Church, does not exclude but rather presupposes the influences, under God, of secondary agents in forming the desire for the priesthood. Amongst these agents the mother undoubtedly holds the first place: Our Blessed Lady, though not a priest, is the Mother of the Priesthood, and Catholic

mothers imitate her most closely when by their prayers and example they succeed in guiding the steps of a child to the altar of God who gives joy to his youth.

The work concludes with a description of life in a seminary leading ultimately to the day of priestly ordination. But the maternal and family influence does not finish here: the memory of his parents, whether dead or alive, is one of the strongest motives helping a priest to be true to his vocation, and their prayers will keep him safe.

Mgr. Hallett's work should be widely read by Catholic parents. It will increase their knowledge and veneration of the priesthood and, in many cases, will happily assist in discovering good vocations.

E. J. M.

Wisdom for Welfare. By Sister M. Dolorita, S.S.N.D. Pp. 72. (Bruce, Milwaukee. \$2.00.)

The Incarnation and other poems. By Doris Burton. Pp. 48. (A. Stockwell, Ilfracombe. 2s. 6d.)

THE matter-of-fact title of Sister Dolorita's work hardly suggests a book of poetry, but when the work has been read the fittingness of the title is apparent. *Wisdom for Welfare* is a dramatic poem in five parts, a religious pageant in five scenes. It is an ambitious essay in choral speaking on a grand scale, arranged for solo voices and choruses of men and women. Given the proper setting, and with careful stage-managing, it should provide the kind of spectacular climax often desired for a religious congress.

There is no connected story running through the book, unless it be an epitome of the human story. Mortal man longs for immortality, and is guided thereto by the Mother of the Immortal. The sufferings of mankind find utterance in a pleading for light in darkness, for hope in despair. The Woman, *Sedes Sapientiae*, listens to her earthly children, then hears and answers by bringing them to the vision of her Heavenly Son. Faith is finally rewarded by the glory of the City of Love.

Miss Doris Burton, who is familiar to Catholic readers as "Lucis Amator", needs no introduction as a writer of elegance in both prose and verse. Her lively imagination and her lyrical gifts would seem to be the ideal equipment for the writing of religious plays for children, such as appear from time to time in *The Sower*. There is an extensive demand in our schools for plays and dramatized Bible History of the kind that Miss Burton could compose.

The longest poem in the present delightful collection is *The Incarnation*. It is probably the author's finest work, as it is certainly her finest theme. Some of the shorter poems also are of high merit, notably *The Valiant Lover*. This well-printed little book contains among its fifty pieces of verse some works eminently suitable for choral speaking, and

it is particularly for this reason that we recommend it to Parish Priests and teachers who require items for their School Entertainment programmes.

L. T. H.

Our Lady's Hours. By Mary Ryan. Pp. xv + 195. (Mercier Press. 6s.)

THE Little Office of Our Lady bears a true resemblance to the Divine Office daily recited by priests and Religious. It is much shorter and simpler, but it is nevertheless a faithful reflection of the *Opus Dei*, particularly in its liturgical character. It is much more widely used than is commonly realized, for it is recited every day by Tertiaries, by members of the "Magnificat" and similar societies, and especially by religious communities of women. Professor Mary Ryan's explanation of the Little Office—which has its difficulties—should have a wide circulation as a practical and efficient guide for thousands of pious souls.

After some preliminary chapters by way of introduction in general, the author proceeds to a careful analysis of the various psalms, antiphons, versicles, responses, prayers and commemorations of which the Office is composed. She is admirably fitted for her task by her wide scholarship and by her thoroughly Catholic intuitions, so that the most meticulous of critics will feel himself everywhere upon safe ground. The book is remarkably easy to read, every page being alive with allusion and interest.

Since the readers of this journal are almost exclusively clerics, this notice of *Our Lady's Hours* will hardly come under the eyes of those people for whom the book is primarily intended. We especially recommend it to the priests who are fortunate enough to be helped in their parochial work by communities of religious women, Sisters who recite Our Lady's Office daily. And not only one copy to the community, dear Fathers, but one to each Sister as a companion to her Office book.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

GRAVE MATTER IN THEFT

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1946, XXVI, p. 430)

"Northerner" writes:

It was a surprise to me to find absolute grave matter at the present time assessed at £4 in the current number of THE CLERGY REVIEW. Is not this a far too low computation? Even twenty years ago at the seminary my professor of moral theology taught us that £4-£5 could be allowed as absolute grave matter and values have changed considerably since then. At a recent theological conference I attended this was a subject which had to be discussed and the opinion of those present was in favour of about £7. Even on the basis of "the weekly wage of the unskilled worker of the more favoured kind", surely £4 is an underestimate? A docker is guaranteed over £4 a week even if he does not have any work to do, and certainly receives much more if he actually works a full week. My caretaker receives over £5 weekly.

Canon Mahoney replies:

The estimation of absolute grave matter has always been drawn solely from the teaching of theologians: if "Northerner" could cite some published opinions of theologians supporting the view that in this country at the present time the sum is something like £7, I would gladly revise my estimate. Perhaps the opinion at the conference was based on the view current amongst American theologians (dollars 35-40), e.g. Jone-Adelman, *Moral Theology* (1945), 324, or O'Connell in *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 1945, XCII, p. 68. This cannot be accepted elsewhere since wages, and the cost of living, are far higher in America than in Europe.

I admit that £4 is a conservative estimate. I have found that one has to be conservative in matters of this kind recorded in print, since in practice it will always be interpreted on a still more generous basis. The weekly wage of an unskilled labourer cannot be exactly defined: in the district where I am living it is about £4.

AN AMBROSIAN PUZZLE

"O.S.B." writes:

The average priest, when he sees St. Ambrose's name at the head of a breviary lesson, prepares himself for trouble. Would you allow me to tell your readers of one Ambrosian crux and its solution?

It occurs at the end of the July lessons for Our Lady's Saturday Office, where the final sentence is of an especial difficulty. The fact is that the breviary text is faulty, reading *generis* instead of *regis*. This emendation having been made, the sentence translates fairly easily:

In the Old Testament, then, a virgin of the Hebrews led their host through the sea: in the New Testament a virgin was chosen as palace for the heavenly King, to bring salvation.

St. Ambrose speaks similarly elsewhere of the Virgin's royal palace, viz. in the hymn *Veni Redemptor gentium*, where he writes:

Procedens de thalamo suo,
Pudoris aulâ regiâ.

An Ambrosian inspiration may fairly be claimed for the Collect for the Vigil of the Assumption: *Deus, qui virginalem aulam beatæ Mariæ, in qua habitares, eligere dignatus es . . .*

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

